Catholic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11228. A bill for the relief of Vito Milazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11229. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co., and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11230. A bill for the relief of Juliana Kovak de Lazarevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

271. By Mr. SCHWEIKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Philadelphia requesting enactment of House Concurrent Resolution No. 465 relative to designating Philadelphia as the host city for the 1976 national bicentennial celebration commemorating two centuries of independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

272. By the SPEAKER: Petition of City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting enactment of House Concurrent Resolution No. 465 relative to designating Philadelphia as the host city for the 1976 national bicentennial celebration commemorating two centuries of independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, September 20, 1965)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we come to Thee at the beginning of our deliberations as from the Nation's beginning our fathers have turned aside to seek Thy face. Commissioned to be peacemakers for a war-torn world, we first need a peace within our own hearts far deeper than the world can give—for never does a new day find us fit for the highest service until we have cleansed and strengthened ourselves by communion with Thee.

We come with confession and contrition. There haunt us memories of duties unperformed, noble promptings disobeyed, deeds of kindness and pity that we have left too late, perhaps words untrue, acts unkind, thoughts impure. The stain of these is on us all. Make us brave enough to bear the truth even about ourselves and sincere enough to rise with our dead selves as stepping stones to higher things, with our climbing feet upon the path of the just and our faces bathed with the shining light that groweth more and more unto the perfect day.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 21, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; and

H.R. 10404. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James E. Bailey, Jr., U.S. Air Force (retired).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 664. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 906. An act to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes;

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Pola Bodenstein;

S. 1190. An act to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska;

S. 1588. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 1623. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource;

S. 1764. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture;

S. 1975. An act to amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act in order to provide certain facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission; and

S. 1988. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; and

H.R. 10404. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James E. Bailey, Jr., U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.; and

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF THE LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 742, H.R. 5842.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5842) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 757), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of H.R. 5842, which is a companion bill to S. 1378, sponsored by Senator Moss for himself and Senators HARRIS, MONRONEY, CHURCH, METCALF, and CARLSON, is to extend the lead-zinc small producers program established by Public Law 87-347 (75 Stat. 766) for a period of 4 years to December 31, 1969. Absent legislation, the program would terminate at the end of this year.

The bill also increases the tonnage a small operator may produce and still qualify for participation in the program to 1,200 tons of each metal from the present limit of 600 tons and it amends the definition of "small domestic producers" to simplify administration.

No new or additional appropriations are authorized nor contemplated. A total of not to exceed $16¼ million over a 4-year period was authorized by the 1961 act, but payments to date have amounted to only $2,132,305.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act provides a program of payments for assistance to small domestic producers of lead and zinc. Payments are based on the difference between the market price of lead and zinc and the statutory stabilization price of 14½ cents per pound. The act limited total payments to $4.5 million during calendar years 1962 and 1963, $4 million during 1964, and $3.5 million during 1965. It defined the term "small domestic producer" so as to limit qualification to those who have not in any 1 year since 1956 produced or sold more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined. A 1963 amendment (act of July 23, 1963; 77 Stat. 92) added a proviso that the principal product or products of such producer must be either lead or zinc or a combination of lead and zinc, thereby precluding those whose major product is other metals or minerals from participating in a program that was established to help small lead and zinc producers.

While the act of October 3, 1961, helped many small producers to continue operations or to reopen closed mines, the number participating in the program has not reached the level anticipated at the time of enactment. Payments during calendar year 1962 totaled $1,012,501; during 1963 they were $766,730; and during 1964 dropped to $310,973. During calendar year 1965 there have been no payments because lead and zinc prices have been at or above the stabilization price of 14½ cents per pound.

The committee has concluded that, at the current rate of consumption and considering existing producers and consumers stocks, the price of lead and zinc will probably remain at or above the stabilization price of 14½ cents per pound for a period of time. However, increased production, coupled with uncertainties related to imports and future consumption, indicate the probability that supplies of lead and zinc will be more than adequate within the next year or two. As a result, unless permanent legislation achieving a long-range stability of the entire lead-zinc industry has been adopted, prices of lead and zinc probably will again fall and many small domestic producers will be forced to close their mines.

In this connection the committee reiterates its belief that a long-range solution to the problems in the lead-zinc industry resulting from violent price fluctuations and their effect on production must be developed for the benefit of the entire industry and the country. Such a long-range solution was worked out in the 87th Congress by the committee in Senator ANDERSON'S S. 1747 which would have provided a flexible quota system affording stability and security to both domestic and foreign producers. This measure was favorably reported by the Interior Committee after comprehensive public hearings. Attention is directed to Senate Reports 867 and 1040 of the 87th Congress. A successor bill by Senator ANDERSON S. 564, of this Congress, is pending before the Committee on Finance.

NEED FOR BROADENING SMALL PRODUCER'S PROGRAM

While reaffirming its conviction of the need for a long-range permanent program for the domestic lead-zinc industry such as that envisioned in Senator ANDERSON'S S. 564, the committee also believes that the Small Producers Act itself needs to be broadened. Experience with the law shows that the requirement that at least 50 percent of a mine's production must be lead and zinc has excluded from the program many bona fide small producers of lead and zinc in States where such metals are found for the most part in conjunction with other metals. An example is Colorado in which mine operators have received no payments under the program although the State is a leading producer of metals.

The committee considered an amendment proposed by Senator ALLOTT to H.R. 5842 to correct this patent inequity, but in view of the necessity from prompt action if the Small Producers Act is not to terminate, decided to report the bill without amendment. The members are in accord that early consideration should be given further amendment to the act early in the second session of the 89th Congress to extend its benefits to bona fide small producers not now eligible.

COST

As stated, enactment of H.R. 5842 will not result in an increase in budgetary requirements. The 1961 act authorized a total program of $16,500,000 over a 4-year period; payments to date have amounted to $2,132,305.

Under the Small Producers' program as modified by H.R. 5842 payments would not exceed $10 million over a 4-year period. Assuming as the committee does, based on information furnished to it, that there will be no payments during calendar year 1965 because of the present price level, and assuming that the maximum payments are made during calendar years 1966 through 1969, inclusive, the total program (including payments already made) will amount to less than $10.2 million as compared with the $16.5 million estimated when the program was authorized by the 87th Congress in 1961.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN VARIOUS STATES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Zeigler Creek, Nebr., Elko watershed, Nevada, Swan Quarter watershed, North Carolina, Frogville Creek, Okla., and Chocolate, Little Chocolate, and Lynn Bayou watersheds, Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for "Salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President,

reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation, "Limitation on salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INSURANCE AND GUARANTEES ON U.S. EXPORTS TO YUGOSLAVIA

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports by that Bank to Yugoslavia totaled $594,970, for the month of August, 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT AND SHARE ACCOUNT INSURANCE ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts, to protect further the safety and liquidity of insured institutions, to strengthen safeguards against conflicts of interest, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on readiness of combat and combat support equipment assigned to the 2d Marine Division and force troops, Camp Lejeune, N.C., U.S. Marine Corps, Department of the Navy, dated September, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings by direct rather than indirect procurement of selected subsystems for F–4 type of aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated September, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for improvement in pricing of change orders for construction of naval vessels, Department of the Navy, dated September 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Agency, during the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN LOUISIANA AND PENNSYLVANIA

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Bayou Boeuf watershed, Mauch Chunk Creek, Pa., Middle Creek, Pa., and Oil Creek, Pa. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public works.

RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

A resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in the 75th session assembled, That this Legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission." Be it further,

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1967, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
President of the Legislature.

Attest:

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 8035. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of property in the county of Suffolk, State of New York, known as the William Floyd Estate, for addition to the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 763).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1855. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 764).

By Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 9417. An act to revise the boundary of Jewel Cave National Monument in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 766).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 2091. An act relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 765).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House (Rept. No. 768);

S. Res. 145. Resolution to provide for responding to invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies (Rept. No. 769); and

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 42d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document (Rept. No. 770).

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

H.R. 7059. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724; 20 U.S.C. 79–79e), to authorize such appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution as are necessary in carrying out its functions under said act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 771).

HEMISFAIR 1968 EXPOSITION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 767)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 2167) to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed together with minority views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 2551. A bill for the relief of Enrique Coscollar Serrano and his wife, Maria-Luz Gonzales de la Cruz Coscollar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the deductibility of contributions by self-employed individuals under qualified pension and profit-sharing plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2553. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elvira Rey de Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2554. A bill for the relief of Jose Ureta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2555. A bill for the relief of Kim Kin Soon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2556. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2557. A bill to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2558. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, Boys Town, Nebr.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2559. A bill for the relief of Nachum E. Braverman, his wife Ariela Braverman, and their children, Gedaya Braverman and Yuvan Braverman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO POWERS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2556) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the transmission of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. MURPHY,
Vice Chairman.

Enclosure.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings

One of the most persistent problems the Board has encountered, particularly in large area route proceedings, has been the contention of applicants at the consolidation stage, based on the doctrine of *Ashbacker Radio Corp.* v. *FCC*, 326 U.S. 327 (1945), that they are entitled as a matter of legal right to consolidation of particular applications. Such an applicant usually asserts that the grant of an application which the Board proposes to hear will preclude a subsequent grant of its own application, and that the Board therefore must also hear its application in the proceeding and accord it comparative consideration. In many instances in the past, a refusal by the Board to consolidate has resulted in an appeal to the courts from the consolidation order, with a request that the court stay further procedural steps in the Board proceeding pending disposition of the petition for review.

This matter was the subject of consideration and action by the Administrative Conference of the United States. The Conference recommended (Recommendation No. 20) in its final report that the Federal Aviation Act be amended so as to provide that (1) contemporaneous consideration of applications, when required, may be accomplished by assigning various of the applications for separate evidentiary hearings and then consolidating them for simultaneous decision by the Board, provided that applicants excluded from a particular hearing are allowed to participate therein as intervenors, adduce evidence, and cross-examine adverse witnesses, (2) contemporaneous consideration of applications is not required when the Board conducts a proceeding to consider applications for a particular type of service within a defined area or over a described route segment and excludes applications (or portions of applications) not proposing service of the particular type within the area or over the segment so described, provided that new authorizations granted in any such proceeding are subject to a mandatory stop at any point common to any application (or portion of an application) excluded from the proceeding, and (3) the Board is not required to hold a preliminary hearing on the issue of consolidating applications.

These recommendations are consistent with prior legislative proposals submitted to the Congress by the Board and are encompassed in the present proposal. The present proposal also incorporates the substance of those heretofore advanced by the Board in areas not specifically dealt with by the recommendations of the Administrative Conference. Thus, the Conference recommendations are silent as to when a party denied consolidation should be permitted to seek judicial review, and also with respect to who should have the burden of proof in connection with requests for consolidation. The Board believes that it is preferable for legislation to be explicit on both of these points.

Accordingly, the Board's proposal provides that an order refusing consolidation or contemporaneous consideration shall not be subject to judicial review until a final order is entered in the proceeding. This is in accord with the Board's consistent position that legal error in consolidation, like any other that may be committed in a particular case, should not be judicially reviewable except as an incident to judicial review of the Board's final order entered at the conclusion of the proceeding. The bill similarly provides that the party making a request for the consolidation of application shall have the burden of establishing that such applications should be considered.

The proposal does not provide, as recommended by the Conference, that applicants excluded from a hearing in connection with contemporaneous consideration of applications shall be allowed to participate therein as intervenors, adduce evidence, and cross-examine adverse witnesses. Such a provision is unnecessary since existing case law requires that applicants in such circumstances be given such rights.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO FATHER FLANAGAN AND BOYS TOWN, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today I am introducing, for myself and my colleague, Senator HRUSKA, two pieces of proposed legislation which seek to honor a man who founded a city. It was a city which was unique at its inception and has now become the model for others around the world. In order to become a citizen, any boy, regardless of his race, nationality, religion, or place of origin who has reached the fifth grade can qualify if he is homeless, abandoned, neglected, or underprivileged.

The city is Boys Town, Nebr., and the founder was the late Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Flanagan. He is better know throughout the world as Father Flanagan of Boys Town.

In December of 1917 with a borrowed $90 and overriding belief that "there is no such thing as a bad boy," he began a journey which was to culminate with his death in Berlin, Germany, in 1948 while serving his country studying child welfare problems in Europe at the request of General MacArthur and the U.S. War Department.

From its humble beginnings, Boys Town has become a city of "little men" which has reclaimed over 9,000 youngsters and turned them into useful and upright citizens. Relying wholly on charity and with no Federal, State, city, or church aid it has grown and flourished. It now comprises 1,500 acres of land, of which 900 are under cultivation, with more than 50 buildings.

The joint resolution and bill which I introduce to honor and commemorate this man seek two things. The joint resolution will authorize Father Flanagan's Boys Home of Boys Town, Nebr., to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia or its environs. All that is asked of the Federal Government is to provide an appropriate site. Boys Town would then bear all the expense incurred in both designing and erecting a suitable mounment.

The bill provides for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of Boys Town.

While a living memorial to this good and humble man is to be found in the hearts of the thousands of young men who have become full members of society through the vision of Father Flanagan, I feel it is appropriate that our Nation's Capital should be the site of a monument for this man who refused to give up on any child merely because someone said he was a bad boy.

For this reason I hope that this legislation will be acted on promptly and favorably.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution and bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2558) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, Boys Town, Nebr., introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, Boys Town, Nebraska. The stamp shall be of such design, submitted on behalf of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, as the Postmaster General shall approve. The stamp shall be of such denomination as the Postmaster General shall determine, shall be first placed on sale at Boys Town, Nebraska, on November 6, 1967, and shall be sold thereafter for such period as the Postmaster General shall determine.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 112) authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Father Flanagan's Boys' Home of Boys Town, Nebraska, is authorized to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of Father Edward J. Flanagan, founder of the world famous home for underprivileged and homeless boys.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to select, with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, a suitable site on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, upon which may be erected the memorial authorized in the first section of this joint resolution. If the site selected is on public grounds belonging to or under the jurisdiction of the government of the District of Columbia, the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall also be obtained.

(b) The design and plans for such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission, and the United States and the District of Columbia shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within five years from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the memorial erected under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, S. 2104, a bill for the relief of Harriet C. Chambers, was considered. Following its consideration the committee determined that inasmuch as this bill concerns the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of certain land, it was a matter more properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Accordingly, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2104, and that it be referred to the proper committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2104) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bills I introduced, September 8, S. 2507 and S. 2508, directing the Secretary of the Interior to institute the study, research, and development of underground transmission lines, that the name of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2532) to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2495) to amend titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code, the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Donald M. Statton, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Iowa, term of 4 years, vice Donald A. Wine, resigned.

Theodore L. Richling, of Nebraska, to be U.S. attorney, district of Nebraska, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Emmett E. Shelby, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Florida, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Donald F. Miller, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Washington, term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, September 29, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 22, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, to require establishment of water quality criteria, and for other purposes;

S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 664. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 906. An act to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes;

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Pola Bodenstein;

S. 1190. An act to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain lands patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska;

S. 1588. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 1623. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource;

S. 1764. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture;

S. 1975. An act to amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act in order to provide certain facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission;

S. 1988. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland; and

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend

through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States," and for other purposes.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] made a speech on the floor of the Senate last week relative to our operations in the Dominican Republic, many words have been spoken in reference to that speech in the Chamber. However, as might have been expected, the reception given the speech outside the halls of Congress was somewhat warmer than the reception given it by certain Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Bennington Banner, of Bennington, Vt., on September 20, entitled "Senator FULBRIGHT'S Unpleasant Truths."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S UNPLEASANT TRUTHS

It will be surprising if Senator FULBRIGHT'S blockbusting statement of last week on U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic doesn't produce a profound chill in his relations with the White House.

Senator FULBRIGHT, to be sure, was careful to blame what he considers gross mishandling of the Dominican crisis on the President's advisers. Yet it is hardly flattering to President Johnson to say that he was pushed by his subordinates into an unjustified military adventure, and into misrepresenting the facts to the American people.

The burden of the Senate foreign policy chairman's argument is that the marines were sent into Santo Domingo last April not, as the President claimed, to save American lives but to prevent "a return to power of Juan Bosch or of a government controlled by Bosch's party, the Dominican Revolutionary Party."

He contends further that estimates of Communist influence in the revolutionary movement were grossly exaggerated and that evidence doesn't verify the administration's assertion that the revolution was in danger of being taken over by Communist elements when we intervened.

Senator FULBRIGHT also raised other important questions that our Latin American policymakers would do well to ponder before they advise the President to intervene in another revolution. Most important, Senator FULBRIGHT asks whether the administration's reaction to the Dominican crisis is part of a broader shift in its attitudes toward Latin American countries.

He makes it clear that social revolution is inevitable in Latin America, and that the United States can use its power to influence the choice the Latin Americans make. This choice, more often than not, will be between corrupt military dictatorships and social revolutionary parties.

"Since just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning," the Senator declared, "the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere."

The United States must decide, he suggested, "whether, by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-Communist left, or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro."

Predictably, the words had hardly left Senator FULBRIGHT'S mouth before he was accused of being soft on communism, but these charges in no way detract from the importance of the issues he has raised. Intervention in the affairs of another nation, as the United States often loudly proclaims, is an extreme and not easily justified course of action. The lessons learned in the Dominican Republic should make us think twice before trying it again.

Under normal circumstances, one might perhaps question the propriety of such a frontal attack by the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on the policies of a Democratic president. But the circumstances in this case are not normal, first, because the Republican leadership in Congress is too illiberal to make the point that FULBRIGHT has made, and second, because the issue raised by our Dominican adventure is far too important to be stifled by a senseless consensus.

It can be argued, perhaps, that the Senator does not make sufficient allowances for the political dilemma which the Johnson administration faced in the Dominican crisis. Obviously the President and his advisers were strongly motivated by a morbid fear of what would happen to the Democrats' political fortunes if they permitted the establishment of "another Cuba." No doubt they reasoned that even in a 1-in-20 chance of a Communist takeover was a risk to be avoided at any cost.

But this is a pretty poor excuse for a decision that alined us with the enemies of reform, violated our solemn treaty obligations, and rendered our Latin American aims deeply suspect among liberals everywhere. FULBRIGHT is right when he says the Johnson administration should have had the sense and the courage to take the minimal risk entailed in casting our lot with the forces of social justice.

Mr. AIKEN. The Bennington Banner, it may be recalled, won first prize last spring for being the best made-up and best established newspaper in the United States, regardless of circulation. I believe the editorial, whether one agrees with all it contains or not, is a fine example of how this small Vermont newspaper happened to win over all the other publications in the United States, both large and small.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senator putting in the RECORD an editorial about the Dominican situation from a Bennington, Vt., newspaper?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. It is a well written editorial, and it relates to the speech which was made by the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], last week.

Mr. CLARK. I have found myself in complete agreement with the editorial, which I thought was very constructive. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont is also in accord.

Mr. AIKEN. I made a few remarks the other day to the effect that while I thought the President was justified in taking some action that night—I think he would probably have been negligent had he not taken some action—I agreed with the Senator from Arkansas that there were a good many unnecessary mistakes made before a temporary government was finally established, primarily by backing the wrong——

Mr. CLARK. Horse?

Mr. AIKEN. The wrong personality to start with, and certain other mistakes which I do not intend to itemize.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Vermont.

PEACEMAKING IN ASIA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the immediate reaction of the United States to the war between Pakistan and India, and to the Chinese border demands upon India, has been one of admirable restraint. President Johnson and his foreign policy advisers are to be commended for the finesse and sophistication they have shown in dealing with this grave crisis in the Asian subcontinent.

In this morning's edition of the Washington Post, Mr. Joseph Kraft contributes a brilliant article, entitled "Peacemaking in Asia," in which he gives the Johnson administration the credit due it for the initial steps taken thus far in dealing with the delicate diplomatic problems posed by this unfortunate war.

I ask unanimous consent that the Kraft column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACEMAKING IN ASIA

(By Joseph Kraft)

Victory a la Hitler and Napoleon, victory that means seized capitals and subdued countries, is not in the cards in the Indian subcontinent. Given the terrain, the size of the forces, and the state of the local art, the worst likely military trouble is intensified fighting ending in the kind of nonend that has characterized almost all frontier struggles in the postwar era.

But there is a serious diplomatic danger that could materialize within a month. It would be possible for Russia to emerge from the present troubles as the dominant diplomatic power in India. China could emerge as the dominant diplomatic power in Pakistan. It is against that awful outcome that American diplomacy must be mobilized.

So far it can be said that the administration has met the test with remarkable sophistication. It has shown a clear appreciation of what has been going on. It has scrupulously avoided panicky reactions and unilateral moves that could only make matters worse. It has even avoided that fatal combination that has been the hallmark of American diplomacy through the decades—the combination of force and unctuous rectitude.

On one side, the Indian side, of the quarrel, this country has for once resisted the temptation to indulge in an orgy of China-baiting. Unlike the Pakistanis, Indians, and Russians who have all been doing the kind of things that make the Chinese look 10 feet tall, the United States has been patient and moderate.

The strongest official statement about Chinese intervention made by the United States was a remark made last week by the Secretary of State after giving testimony to the Congress. Because it produced banner headlines of an American warning to Peiping, the statement is worth reproducing in full.

Mr. Rusk was asked about charges that Communist China has been "egging on" the

fight on the subcontinent. In a reply of studied mildness, he said: "I think there are those who feel that China is trying to fish in troubled waters here. Our own advice to Peiping would be not to do that and to stay out of it and give the Security Council of the United Nations a chance to settle this matter."

On the other side of the quarrel, the Pakistani side, this country has resisted the itch to make moral judgments about the Kashmir issue. Instead of trying, as the Pakistanis put it, to solve the problem rather than the symptoms, Washington has kept its righteousness under firm control. The closest this country has come to a pronouncement on Kashmir was again the comment made by the Secretary of State after testimony on the Hill last week.

His words were remarkable for measured care. And once again, because they were widely misinterpreted, they are worth citing.

Mr. Rusk was asked about a plebiscite that would achieve self-determination on Kashmir. He said: "We have expressed our views on that subject over the years. That is part of a general problem of solution of outstanding issues between India and Pakistan. We believe that these matters should be taken up and resolved by peaceful means. We do not believe they should be resolved by force."

With this country keeping its tone measured, the Russians and Chinese, far from scoring great gains as the beaky hawks would assert, have overreached themselves. The Chinese, fearful that a settlement of sorts might be in the works, issued their ultimatums in the evident hope of preventing Pakistan from coming to terms. Lacking the capacity for truly serious action on the ground, they have been obliged to extend the ultimatum. It is now not easy to see how they will emerge without a simultaneous loss of prestige, and a new confirmation of their role as chief international troublemaker.

For their part, the Russians, after issuing the kind of warnings bound to incite Peiping, have pulled the grandstand play of calling for a meeting of Indian and Pakistani representatives in Moscow. If it comes off at all, which is extremely doubtful, it is hard to see how a Moscow meeting can yield concrete results. Far from making the most of an opportunity, the Russians seem merely to be underlining their own limitations. They may end up with egg all over their face.

The lesson here is not simply Milton's homily that "they also serve who only stand and wait"; that, after all, was an ode to blindness. The true lesson, the lesson for those who would see in the dark, is that in this country's contacts with the Chinese Communists, the bellicose reaction is almost always the wrong reaction. The right policy is to turn to account against the Chinese the miasmic political swamps that fringe the Asian heartland. And nowhere is that more true than in that other Asian trouble spot that we all know in our bones is dimly related to the crisis in the subcontinent—Vietnam.

SPECIAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES SERVING IN COMBAT ZONES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2127) to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating "Subchapter III—General" thereof as "Subchapter IV—General" and by inserting immediately after subchapter II thereof the following new subchapter III:

"SUBCHAPTER III—SERVICEMEN'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

"§ 765. Definitions

"For the purpose of this subchapter—

"(1) The term 'active duty' means full-time duty as a commissioned or warrant officer, or as an enlisted member of a uniformed service under a call or order to duty that does not specify a period of thirty days or less.

"(2) The term 'member' means a person on active duty in the uniformed services in a commissioned, warrant, or enlisted rank or grade.

"(3) The term 'uniformed services' means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Environmental Science Services Administration.

"§ 766. Eligible insurance companies

"(a) The Administrator is authorized, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), to purchase from one or more life insurance companies a policy or policies of group life insurance to provide the benefits specified in this subchapter. Each such life insurance company must (1) be licensed to issue life insurance in each of the fifty States of the United States and in the District of Columbia, and (2) as of the most recent December 31 for which information is available to the Administrator, have in effect at least 1 per centum of the total amount of group life insurance which all life insurance companies have in effect in the United States.

"(b) The life insurance company or companies issuing such policy or policies shall establish an administrative office at a place and under a name designated by the Administrator.

"(c) The Administrator shall arrange with the life insurance company or companies issuing any policy or policies under this subchapter to reinsure, under conditions approved by him, portions of the total amount of insurance under such policy or policies with such other life insurance companies (which meet qualifying criteria set forth by the Administrator) as may elect to participate in such reinsurance.

"(d) The Administrator may at any time discontinue any policy or policies which he has purchased from any insurance company under this subchapter.

"§ 767. Persons insured; amount

"(a) Any policy of insurance purchased by the Administrator under section 766 of this title shall automatically insure any member of the uniformed services on active duty against death in the amount of $10,000 from the first day of such duty, or from the date certified by the Administrator to the Secretary concerned as the date Servicemen's Group Life Insurance under this subchapter takes effect, whichever date is the later date, unless such member elects in writing (1) not to be insured under this subchapter, or (2) to be insured in the amount of $5,000.

"(b) If any member elects not to be insured under this subchapter or to be insured in the amount of $5,000, he may thereafter be insured under this subchapter or insured in the amount of $10,000 under this subchapter, as the case may be, upon written application, proof of good health, and compliance with such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"§ 768. Termination of coverage; conversion

"Each policy purchased under this subchapter shall contain a provision, in terms approved by the Administrator, to the effect that any insurance thereunder on any member of the uniformed services shall cease (except in the case of members absent without leave) one hundred and twenty days after his separation or release from active duty, and that during the period such insurance is in force the insured upon request to the administrative office established under subsection 766(b) of this title shall be furnished a list of life insurance companies participating in the program established under this subchapter and upon written application (within such period) to the participating company selected by the insured and payment of the required premiums be granted insurance without a medical examination on a plan then currently written by such company which does not provide for the payment of any sum less than the face value thereof or for the payment of an additional amount as premiums if the insured engages in the military service of the United States, to replace the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance in effect on the insured's life under this subchapter. In addition to life insurance companies participating in the program established under this subchapter, such list shall include additional life insurance companies (not so participating) which meet qualifying criteria, terms, and conditions established by the Administrator and agree to sell insurance to members and former members in accordance with the provisions of the preceding sentence. In the case of any member who is absent without leave for a period of more than thirty-one days, insurance under this subchapter shall cease as of the date such absence commenced. Any such member so absent without leave, upon return to duty, may again be insured under this subchapter, but only if he complies with the requirements set forth in section 767(b) of this section.

"§769. Deductions; payment; investment; expenses

"(a) During any period in which a member is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Administrator under section 766 of this title, there shall be deducted each month from his basic or other pay until separation or release from active duty an amount determined by the Administrator (which shall be the same for all such members) as the share of the cost attributable to insuring such member under such policy, less any cost traceable to the extra hazard of active duty in the uniformed service. Any amount not deducted from the basic or other pay of a member insured under this subchapter while on active duty, if not otherwise paid, shall be deducted from the proceeds of any insurance thereafter payable. The initial monthly amount determined by the Administrator to be charged under this subsection for insurance under this subchapter may be continued from year to year, except that the Administrator may redetermine such monthly amount from time to time in accordance with experience. No refunds will be made to any member of any such amount properly deducted from his basic or other pay to cover the insurance granted under this subchapter.

"(b) For each month for which any member is so insured, there shall be contributed from the appropriation made for his pay an amount determined by the Administrator and certified to the Secretary concerned to be the cost of such insurance which is traceable to the extra hazard of active duty in the uniformed services. Such cost shall be determined by the Administrator on the basis of the excess mortality suffered by members and former members of the uniformed services insured under this subchapter above that incurred by the male civilian population of the United States of the same age as the median age of members of the uniformed services (disregarding a fraction of a year) as shown by the records

of the uniformed services, the primary insurer or insurers, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, together with the most current estimates of such mortality. The Administrator is authorized to make such adjustments regarding such contributions from pay appropriations as may be indicated from actual experience.

"(c) An amount equal to the first amount due on any such insurance may be advanced from current appropriations for active-service pay to any such member, which amount shall constitute a lien upon any service or other pay accruing to the person from whom such advance was made and shall be collected therefrom if not otherwise paid. No disbursing or certifying officer shall be responsible for any loss incurred by reason of such advance.

"(d) (1) The sums withheld from the basic or other pay of members under subsection (a) of this section, and the sums contributed from appropriations under subsection (b) of this section, together with the income derived from any dividends or premium rate adjustments received from insurers shall be deposited to the credit of a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States. All premium payments and extra hazard costs on any insurance policy or policies purchased under section 766 of this title and the administrative cost to the Veterans' Administration of insurance issued under this subchapter shall be paid from the revolving fund.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to set aside out of the revolving fund such amounts as may be required to meet the administrative costs to the Veterans' Administration of insurance issued under this subchapter and all current premium payments and extra hazard costs on any insurance policy or policies purchased under section 766 of this title. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in and to sell and retire special interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the account of the revolving fund. Such obligations issued for this purpose shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield (computed by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue) on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt which are not due or callable until after the expiration of four years from the end of such calendar month; except that where such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such obligation shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such market yield.

"(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, the Administrator shall, from time to time, determine the administrative costs to the Veterans Administration which in his judgment are properly allocable to insurance issued under this subchapter and shall transfer such cost from the revolving fund to the appropriation 'General operating expenses, Veterans' Administration'.

"§ 770. Beneficiaries; payment of insurance

"(a) Any amount of insurance under this subchapter in force on any member or former member on the date of his death shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date of his death, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries as the member or former member may have designated by a writing received in the uniformed services prior to such death;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of such member or former member;

"Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of such member or former member and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of such member or former member or the survivor of them;

"Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such member or former member;

"Sixth, if none of the above, to other next of kin of such member or former member entitled under the laws of domicile of such member or former member at the time of his death.

"(b) If any person otherwise entitled to payment under this section does not make claim therefor within one year after the death of the member or former member, or if payment to such person within that period is prohibited by Federal statute or regulation, payment may be made in the order of precedence as if such person had predeceased the member or former member, and any such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(c) If, within two years after the death of the member or former member, no claim for payment has been filed by any person entitled under the order of procedure set forth in this section, and neither the Administrator nor the administrative office established by the insurance company or companies pursuant to section 766(b) of this title has received any notice that any such claim will be made, payment may be made to a claimant as may in the judgment of the Administrator be equitably entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person. If, within four years after the death of the member or former member, payment has not been made pursuant to this section and no claim for payment by any person entitled under this section is pending, the amount payable shall escheat to the credit of the revolving fund referred to in section 769(d).

"(d) The member may elect settlement of insurance under this subchapter either in a lump sum or in thirty-six equal monthly installments. If no such election is made by the member the beneficiary or beneficiaries may elect settlement either in a lump sum or in thirty-six equal monthly installments. If the member has elected settlement in a lump sum, the beneficiary or beneficiaries may elect settlement in thirty-six equal monthly installments.

"§ 771. Basic tables of premiums; readjustment of rates

"(a) Each policy or policies purchased under section 766 of this title shall include for the first policy year a schedule of basic premium rates by age which the Administrator shall have determined on a basis consistent with the lowest schedule of basic premium rates generally charged for new group life insurance policies issued to large employers, this schedule of basic premium rates by age to be applied, except as otherwise provided in this section, to the distribution by age of the amount of group life insurance under the policy at its date of issue to determine an average basic premium per $1,000 of insurance. Each policy so purchased shall also include provisions whereby the basic rates of premium determined for the first policy year shall be continued for subsequent policy years, except that they may be readjusted for any subsequent year, based on the experience under the policy, such readjustment to be made by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy on a basis determined by the Administrator in advance of such year to be consistent with the general practice of life insurance companies under policies of group life insurance issued to large employers.

"(b) The total premiums for the policy or policies shall be the sum of the amounts computed according to the provisions of subsection (a) above and the estimated costs traceable to the extra hazard of active duty in the uniformed services as determined by the Administrator, subject to the provision that such estimated costs traceable to the extra hazard shall be retroactively readjusted annually in accordance with section 769(b).

"(c) Each policy so purchased shall include a provision that, in the event the Administrator determines that ascertaining the actual age distribution of the amounts of group life insurance in force at the date of issue of the policy or at the end of the first or any subsequent year of insurance thereunder would not be possible except at a disproportionately high expense, the Administrator may approve the determination of a tentative average group life premium, for the first or any subsequent policy year, in lieu of using the actual age distribution. Such tentative average premium rate shall be redetermined by the Administrator during any policy year upon request by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy, if experience indicates that the assumptions made in determining the tentative average premium rate for that policy year were incorrect.

"(d) Each policy so purchased shall contain a provision stipulating the maximum expense and risk charges for the first policy year, which charges shall have been determined by the Administrator on a basis consistent with the general level of such charges made by life insurance companies under policies of group life insurance issued to large employers. Such maximum charges shall be continued from year to year, except that the Administrator may redetermine such maximum charges for any year either by agreement with the insurance company or companies issuing the policy or upon written notice given by the Administrator to such companies at least one year in advance of the beginning of the year for which such redetermined maximum charges will be effective.

"(e) Each such policy shall provide for an accounting to the Administrator not later than ninety days after the end of each policy year, which shall set forth, in a form approved by the Administrator, (1) the amounts of premiums actually accrued under the policy from its date of issue to the end of such policy year, (2) the total of all mortality and other claim charges incurred for that period, and (3) the amounts of the insurers' expense and risk charge for that period. Any excess of the total of item (1) over the sum of items (2) and (3) shall be held by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy as a special contingency reserve to be used by such insurance company or companies for charges under such policy only, such reserve to bear interest at a rate to be determined in advance of each policy year by the insurance company or companies issuing the policy, which rate shall be approved by the Administrator as being consistent with the rates generally used by such company or companies for similar funds held under other group life insurance policies. If and when the Administrator determines that such special contingency reserve has attained an amount estimated by the Administrator to make satisfactory provision for adverse fluctuations in future charges under the policy, any further excess shall be deposited to the credit of the revolving fund established under section 766 of this title. If and when such policy is discontinued, and if after all charges have been made, there is any positive balance remaining in such special contingency reserve, such balance shall be deposited to the credit of the revolving fund, subject to the right of the insurance company or com-

panies issuing the policy to make such deposit in equal monthly installments over a period of not more than two years.

"§ 772. Benefit certificates

"The Administrator shall arrange to have each member insured under a policy purchased under section 766 of this title receive a certificate setting forth the benefits to which the member is entitled thereunder, to whom such benefit shall be payable, to whom claims should be submitted, and summarizing the provisions of the policy principally affecting the member. Such certificate shall be in lieu of the certificate which the insurance company or companies would otherwise be required to issue.

"§ 773. Forfeiture

"Any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion, or who, because of conscientious objections, refuses to perform service in the Armed Forces of the United States or refuses to wear the uniform of such force, shall forfeit all rights to Servicemen's Group Life Insurance under this subchapter. No such insurance shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment for crime or for military or naval offense, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States.

"§ 774. Advisory Council on Servicemen's Group Life Insurance

"There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Servicemen's Group Life Insurance consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury as Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, each of whom shall serve without additional compensation. The Council shall meet once a year, or oftener at the call of the Administrator, and shall review the operations under this subchapter and advise the Administrator on matters of policy relating to his activities thereunder.

"§ 775. Jurisdiction of District Courts

"The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action or claim against the United States founded upon this subchapter.

"§ 776. Effective date

"The insurance provided for in this subchapter and the deductions and contributions for that purpose shall take effect on the date designated by the Administrator and certified by him to each Secretary concerned."

(b) Section 211(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "775," immediately before "784".

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by redesignating "SUBCHAPTER III—GENERAL" as "SUBCHAPTER IV—GENERAL" and (2) by inserting after

"760. Waiver of premium payment on due date."

the following:

"SUBCHAPTER III—SERVICEMEN'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

"Sec.
"765. Definitions.
"766. Eligible insurance companies.
"767. Persons insured; amount.
"768. Termination of coverage; conversion.
"769. Deductions; payment; investment; expenses.
"770. Beneficiaries; payment of insurance.
"771. Basic tables of premiums; readjustment of rates.
"772. Benefit certificates.
"773. Forfeiture.
"774. Advisory Council on Servicemen's Group Life Insuranec.
"775. Jurisdiction of District Courts.
"776. Effective date."

SEC. 3. (a) In the case of each veteran who died or dies—

(1) as a direct result of actions of hostile forces;

(2) as a direct result of an accident involving a military or naval aircraft or an aircraft under charter to the Department of Defense, Army, Navy, or Air Force;

(3) as a direct result of an explosion of an instrumentality of war; or

(4) while performing service for which incentive pay for hazardous duty or special pay is authorized by section 301, 304, or 310 of title 37, United States Code;

while in the active military, naval, or air service during the period from January 1, 1957, to the date immediately preceding the date on which the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance program is placed in effect pursuant to section 776 of title 38, United States Code, both dates inclusive, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay a death gratuity to the widow or widower, child or children, or parent or parents of such veteran, as provided in subsection (b), in an amount not exceeding $5,000, determined as provided in subsection (c), but only if (A) application is made for such death gratuity within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and (B) the person or persons receiving a death gratuity under this section waive all future rights to death compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation, under title 38, United States Code, on account of the death of such veteran.

(b) The death gratuity authorized by this section shall be paid to the following classes of persons and in the order named—

(1) to the widow or widower of the veteran, if living;

(2) if no widow or widower, to the child or children of the veteran, if living, in equal shares;

(3) if no widow, widower, or child, to the parent or parents of the veteran who last bore that relationship, if living, in equal shares.

(c)(1) The death gratuity authorized by this section shall be $5,000 reduced by the aggregate amount of (A) United States Government Life Insurance and National Service Life Insurance paid or payable on account of the death of such veteran and (B) any death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation received on account of the death of such veteran by the person or persons who receive such death gratuity.

(2) In any case where two or more persons are eligible for a death gratuity under this section on account of the death of the same veteran but one or more of such persons do not waive future death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation payable under title 38, the Administrator shall pay his or their share of such death gratuity to the person or persons waiving such compensation. However, the death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation payable to any other person shall not be increased solely as the result of an election and waiver under this section.

(3) The right of any person to payment of a death gratuity under this section shall be conditioned upon his being alive to receive such payment. No person shall have a vested right to any such payment and any payment not made during the person's lifetime shall be paid to the person or persons within the permitted class next entitled to priority, as provided in subsection (b).

(d) Any terms used in this section which are defined in section 101 or 102(b) of title 38, United States Code, shall, for the purposes of this section, have the meanings given to them by such section 101 or 102(b), except that (1) the term "veteran", as used in this section, includes a person who dies while in the active military, naval, or air service and (2) the term "child" shall not be limited with respect to age or marital status.

(e) Appropriations made to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and Pensions" shall be available for the payment of death gratuities under this section.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the House amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 26, of the attached bill, S. 2127, as passed by the House, strike out "as a direct result of an explosion of an instrumentality of war; or" and substitute in lieu thereof "as a direct result of the extra hazard of military or naval service, as such hazard may be determined by the Administrator; or".

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee [Mr. TEAGUE], and also with the distinguished chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Insurance. It was considered by them and me as being a necessary provision, which broadens the scope of the House amendment.

The original bill, S. 2127, was offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and myself.

Hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Finance. The bill was reported unanimously to the Senate by the Committee on Finance, and passed unanimously by the Senate. The bill was sent to the other body. The House decided to broaden the scope of the bill, and the House language has greatly improved the Senate bill.

I therefore ask that the Senate adopt my amendment and concur in the House amendment as thus amended.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on June 11 of this year, my very able and distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] introduced S. 2127, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones. I was indeed happy to cosponsor this legislation with him. It was also cosponsored by the very able and distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

On August 19 the Senate unanimously passed this measure, and it was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House of Representatives.

After the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made improvements in the legislation sponsored by Senator TALMADGE, Senator WILLIAMS and myself, the House unanimously passed this legislation.

As it is true in the legislative process of the Congress each body makes improvements in legislation before it is finally enacted.

I would like to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House [Mr. TEAGUE] and the members of his committee, for doing a remarkable job in further improving this legislation so that today we have before us a bill to provide needed protection for those serving in our Armed Forces.

In discussing the improvements and changes made by the House of Representatives with Senator TALMADGE and Senator WILLIAMS, I urge my colleagues to accept the House amendments and send the measure forthwith to the President hopefully for his approval.

The bill as presently before us provides a group life insurance plan for all members of the uniformed services on active duty on and after the effective date designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Coverage is automatic with the serviceman being required to take affirmative action to remove himself from the program.

The coverage provided is $10,000 or $5,000. Premium rates for the servicemen are expected to be $2 a month for the $10,000 policy and $1 per month for the $5,000 policy. These premiums would be deducted from the pay of the servicemen by the Department of Defense and remitted to the Veterans' Administration.

All costs traceable to extra hazards of servicemen will be borne by the Government, otherwise the program would be self-sustaining with the deductions that I have previously referred to.

Under the provisions of the measure, if an individual has a service-connected disability, he would be eligible for a commercial policy without medical examination, and in addition would be eligible for a $10,000 disabled veterans' insurance policy administered by the Veterans' Administration. In the latter case he must apply for the policy within 1 year of the date of the establishment of the service-connected disability.

Another important improvement made in the bill as passed by the Senate provides for the period January 1, 1967, and continuing until the effective date of the group insurance plan a maximum death gratuity of $5,000 to a widow, child or children and the parents of individuals who served during this period in one of the branches of the Armed Services and who lost their lives under certain hazardous conditions as a result of such service.

This gratuity would be reduced by the amount of any dependency and indemnity compensation, National Service Life Insurance, or U.S. Government life insurance payable in the particular case.

I feel that this much-needed legislation warrants the prompt and final action by the Congress to provide for those in the Armed Forces who are making great sacrifices in defending this country's freedom as well as that of the free world.

Knowing that we care at home about the future welfare of our Armed Forces personnel and their dependents certainly would do much toward bolstering their spirits at times when many of us have a tendency to forget and take for granted the freedoms which we enjoy today as a result of the services they are rendering to our country.

I cannot urge too strongly that the Senate accept the House amendments and send the bill forthwith to the President for signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

The amendment to the House amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on concurring in the House amendment as amended.

The amendment of the House, as amended, was agreed to.

CEASE-FIRE IN THE INDO-PAKISTAN DISPUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the cease-fire which appears to have been achieved in the Indo-Pakistan dispute is an event of great magnitude for the orderly and peaceful management of international conflicts. It brings renewed hope in the efficacy of the United Nations Security Council as a major instrument for the maintenance of peace. To be sure, the basic problem of Kashmir remains to be resolved. To be sure, the cease-fire may not hold indefinitely. But neither factor detracts from the achievement. The cease-fire reflects, may I say, great credit both on India and Pakistan and on the policies of every government represented on the United Nations Security Council. It is the best possible response not only to the immediate fighting between India and Pakistan but to those who would fish in troubled waters.

On the part of the United States, I want to say, further, that President Johnson has guided our limited but significant part in this matter with policies of exceptional wisdom and great good sense.

In their cautious and restrained approach to this problem, the President, the Secretary of State, and our outstanding Ambassador at the United Nations, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, have made a highly significant contribution to the restoration of order in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent, to the forestalling of the rapid spread of chaos in Asia and to the general strengthening of the prospect for international action for peace through the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with the Senator in expressing gratification over what has happened. It is especially significant because it again establishes the importance of the role of the United Nations, which seemed for the moment to have fallen into a state of desuetude because of its financial troubles.

We are all indebted to President Johnson and to United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg for the part they played in avoidance of what could have led to the terrible conflagration of a war much broader than the conflict between India and Pakistan, and in the revival of the role of the United Nations in a most significant way.

I am grateful to the Senator from Montana for his comments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from New York. Furthermore, I believe that the outcome of the difficulties between India and Pakistan indicates quite strongly the wisdom of the President's approach through the United Nations and, in effect, emphasizes that the idea of unilateral intervention on our part was not the correct procedure but, rather, that it was multilateral intervention, in a sense, through dependence on the Security Council of the United Nations, which, in this instance, I am informed, was unanimous in its outlook.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I rise to commend the United Nations, Secretary General U Thant, President Johnson, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the many other nations who have participated in bringing about a cessation of the murderous hostilities between India and Pakistan.

This action illustrates the power of concerted effort by men and nations of good will. It also illustrates once again the vitality and urgent necessity for a world organization such as the United Nations. I commend that organization and the principle of collective security.

I applaud the existence of a world organization where debate and consultation among nations can occur—indeed, where debate even between nations engaging in hostilities on the battlefield can occur.

I also applaud the existence of a world organization in which the power of world opinion can be focused. Once again it seems to me that the success of the United Nations and the members thereof, in bringing about a cessation of hostilities, demonstrates the necessity and the urgency for the existence of such an organization.

DEDICATION OF EISENHOWER COLLEGE, SENECA FALLS, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday, an event occurred in the State of New York which I believe deserves the attention of Congress. The first college named after our former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was dedicated at Seneca Falls, N.Y., which lies in the center of the State, near beautiful Cayuga Lake, some 30 miles from Syracuse.

The college is headed by Dr. Earl J. McGrath, former Federal Commissioner of Education.

Speaking at the dedication were many distinguished leaders, including, of course, former President Eisenhower, and Governor Rockefeller, of our State.

I had planned to be there but was unable to do so because of the possibility of a vote on the immigration bill, which is of critical importance to my State, and the need for various negotiations in that respect.

Mr. President, the college is most enterprising. It is a voluntary college—an independent college, as it were. It will operate in a completely nonsectarian way. It proposes to pursue an accelerated year-round, trimester plan, giving unusual opportunities to its students. It will emphasize not only the liberal arts but also political science, and as we would expect world affairs.

Mr. President, I join with millions of other Americans in gratification over the fact that such a college has been initi-

ated in the name of President Eisenhower and to wish for it—as I am sure will all Americans—a future of prosperity, success, and eminence in the field of higher education.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press news story of the ground-breaking which appeared in today's Baltimore Sun, and an explanation of the college's purpose as contained in the booklet, "A College of Special Promise."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 22, 1965]

PROUD IKE BREAKS GROUND FOR EISENHOWER COLLEGE

SENECA FALLS, N.Y., September 21.—Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower broke ground today for a college named after him and pronounced it an honor that "will be with me every day of my life."

Speaking at ceremonies on the site of Eisenhower College, the former Chief Executive said "the liberal arts college is the key to the understanding and exercise of real citizenship. I feel we must have more of them."

NO GREATER HONOR

Eisenhower College, scheduled to open in 1967, is to be a 4-year, liberal arts institution.

The one-time President told an estimated 12,000 persons gathered at the 265-acre site east of here, that he could think of no greater honor than having the college named for him.

"This honor that is accorded me will be with me every day of my life," he said.

The 74-year-old former Chief Executive said he disagreed with those who prophesied that small liberal arts colleges are a thing of the past. He said the liberal arts college should "seek its natural habitat in the rural areas. Let the big universities go to the cities."

He said such colleges would develop in the student moral standards and "a feeling of accommodation for understanding his fellow citizens."

President Johnson sent a telegram of congratulations praising officials who named the college in honor of "a man who has spent his lifetime in educational endeavor."

GREETED BY ROCKEFELLERS

Mr. Eisenhower flew here from his Gettysburg, Pa., farm and was greeted by Gov. and Mrs. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

He was introduced by his friend and occasional golfing companion, comedian Bob Hope. The former President laughed heartily in response to several quips by Hope.

"This is a great idea, this college," Hope said, adding:

"Our future Republicans have to come from some place. Where else but in America could a man in command of our armies, leader of our country, and a leader in the field of education, wind up in Seneca Falls shoveling dirt."

Dr. Earl J. McGrath, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, will serve as chancellor of Eisenhower College. The college, which overlooks Cayuga Lake, eventually will provide for an enrollment of about 1,500 students.

SIX SPECIAL EMPHASES

First, last, and always, the main objective of Eisenhower College will be high quality education. Lessons from the past will be applied; the mistakes avoided. In six main areas of policy and procedure, the focus will be on new contemporary keys for quality education.

1. World outlook: "The entire corporate life of Eisenhower College will reflect the fact that we live today in an international community in which provincial thought and behavior are as outmoded as Ptolemaic astronomy. The graduates of Eisenhower College will live in a world completely different from that of their grandfathers. Already they can travel to Cairo, Buenos Aires, or Tokyo more quickly than their forebears could travel from Seneca Falls to Albany; and when they arrive, they are confronted with a culture and a way of life arrestingly different from their own. On transoceanic television they see events in distant lands as rapidly as they happen.

"An American who knows little or nothing about the politics, economics, religion, industry, commerce, ambitions, and needs of other peoples has had an education which has failed to prepare him to live intelligently in the world of today and tomorrow."

So writes Dr. Earl McGrath. And he adds:

"Yet a recent report, entitled 'Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs,' reveals that few students in the 175 institutions studied understood the facts of international life. The causes of their ignorance and indifferences are doubtless many, but an analysis of college courses disclosed little real effort on the part of institutions to prepare students for the roles they will have to play as members of the international community.

"There were courses in international politics, economics and culture, but these were few and designed for the small percentage of students specializing in some aspect of international affairs. The author concluded that if all students were to gain an interest in, and understanding of, events and peoples in other parts of the world and our relations to them, all departments would have to be involved. Indeed the entire campus life should reflect the institution's concern with the world scene."

Eisenhower College will make international studies part of every student's curriculum. Under a program coordinated by a dean of world studies, there will be insistence on a foundation for all: on extracurricular influences working on all; on a world view which will find practical or philosophic expression in every department of the curriculum.

Many institutions have excellent courses on international relations; or on the history, literature and culture of certain other nations; or excellent programs of study in depth for some special geographic area. As a rule these are optional, or only for the future specializer. Only a limited proportion of most student bodies is touched by these studies. When change and improvement are sought, internal solidification is a hindrance and only limited extensions can be grafted on. But Eisenhower College starts new and unencumbered. Its potential for success is immensely advanced. The means for reaching its goal is built in from the start, not tacked onto something existing and different.

2. Select curriculum: "The achievement of the liberal arts purpose requires far fewer courses than are common today. With few exceptions liberal arts colleges have allowed the several departments to expand beyond any defensible limit. Studies of a number of curriculums in such institutions disclose broad arrays of instructions, sometimes nearly as many courses as students, much of which is so highly specialized and technical that it should be reserved for graduate departments or professional schools. This excessive proliferation usually results in a large percentage of small and expensive classes (sometimes over 40 percent of all courses enroll fewer than 10 students). These extravagances proportionately dissipate the efforts of the faculty, commensurately reduce their salaries, and make the student's education a collection of fragmentary and disjointed intellectual experiences."

Again so writes Dr. McGrath.

Eisenhower College will keep waste out of its curriculum from the start. It can do this successfully because it starts with a basic curriculum and has no vested faculty interests to combat. Eighteen academic departments (instead of the frequent 25 to 30) will offer fewer than 250 courses plus four interdisciplinary courses (instead of the usual 500–600 courses or more), totaling 840 credit hours (compared with the usual 1,500–2,000 hours).

From this select curriculum will come:

Greater concentration on liberal arts essentials;

Better teaching;

Fewer wasteful small classes;

Smaller faculty and higher salaries;

All leading to a better faculty and a spiral of increasing quality.

3. Year-round operation: Year-round operation will be brought about through use of the trimester plan. Each year will comprise three 14-week terms. Normally, therefore, the Eisenhower College student will complete his degree work in eight terms, or 2⅔ years, although exceptions will be made, of course, in cases of illness or other interruption.

This system of year-round operation embodies numerous advantages:

Gross annual income increase of 30 to 40 percent.

Combined with a smaller faculty as a result of reducing the curriculum to proper dimensions, this enables significantly higher salaries.

The college plant does not stand relatively idle for a quarter of the year.

The student's education is speeded. This is a growingly important consideration for the rapidly increasing numbers who are planning an additional 3 or 4 years of postgraduate or professional education. Also more than a year is added to the student's period of earning power.

Many colleges and universities have considered full-time year-round operation, and a few have introduced it in one form or another. Almost inevitably its advantages have not been fully realized since it represents a choice and not the norm, and because the traditional system is too entrenched. At Eisenhower College, three trimesters per year will be the standard.

4. An outstanding teaching faculty: College teachers are in short supply. The best college teachers are far too few. Eisenhower College intends to be one of the places to which they gravitate. (Keen interest has already been expressed by established teachers in leading institutions across the country.) Elements which produce this gravitational pull include an academic environment which is stimulating to the keenest mind; a challenge to teach well, but with opportunity for research, publication, study and travel; a sound, but unbiased, Christian outlook; an academic calendar so constructed as to provide refresher breaks three times each year and a regular 4-month leave every 3 years; a curriculum trimmed of frills and irrelevancies so that concentration may be centered on essentials; salaries competitive from the very beginning with the wealthiest colleges; the stimulus of a new program, a share in the direction of educational policies; and such fringe attractions as residence in an attractive region near metropolitan centers.

5. A broad range of student opportunity: Whatever the background of circumstances and pre-college achievement—it is the promise of the applicant that will determine his admission to Eisenhower College. A common false index of "excellence" has been the limitation of admissions to students in the top 10 percent or even 5 percent of their high school classes. This excludes many talents of significant promise. Under these

standards, many of the most distinguished graduates of our ivy-covered institutions could not gain admission to those same colleges today.

Admission to Eisenhower College will represent not solely a reward for past performance, but also a challenge for the future. Potential motivation will count heavily in the balance of qualifications. Eisenhower College believes that students of promise are distributed widely throughout at least the top 40 percent of high school achievers and not confined to the top 10 percent. Therefore, while maintaining unremittingly high standards, its doors will be open to a much broader range of promise than is usual.

6. An efficient college plant: Education often suffers in quality because of an inadequate, poorly planned, wasteful plant. At Eisenhower College, the plant will be planned from the start, and in its entirety, to serve the highest intellectual uses. Kinds of buildings, size, arrangement and location will all be designed as integral parts of the educational program itself. Administrative, academic and living quarters will be interrelated for maximum use and impact. The plant, like the curriculum, will be designed to serve as a demonstration model. Preliminary architectural studies are proceeding, and it is Eisenhower College's uncompromising aim to bring the leading architectural insights to the service of its high academic goals.

These are the six outstanding features of quality at Eisenhower College: World outlook, select curriculum, year-round operation, an outstanding teaching faculty, a broad range of student opportunity, and an efficient college plant.

Certain of these, alone, might make Eisenhower College a noteworthy undertaking. Added together, they form a truly unique profile, significant for the future of higher education, with a real potential for greatness.

APPOINTMENT OF ELMER HOEHN AS HEAD OF OIL IMPORT PROGRAM: AN INSULT TO AMERICAN CONSUMERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at 9:30 this morning, Mr. Elmer Hoehn was sworn in as head of the Oil Import Administration.

If the administration tried to find a man who would be least likely to protect the interests of the millions of American consumers of oil, it could not have done worse.

Mr. Hoehn was executive secretary of the Independent Oil Producers & Land Owners Association, Tristate. This organization represents producers in Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky.

It has played an active role in advocating the cutting of imports proposed by the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

As Oil Import Administrator, Hoehn will have the top responsibility for adjusting imports of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States in accordance with the Presidential proclamation of March 10, 1959. Hoehn will run this operation under the Secretary of the Interior.

The 1959 Presidential proclamation in the interest of national security imposes restrictions on the importation of crude oil, unfinished oil and finished petroleum products.

As Administrator Hoehn will allocate imports of oil among qualified applicants. He will issue import licenses on the basis of such allocations.

Thus, a man who had been hired to represent the oil interests fighting quotas will now sit in the driver's seat to determine how big those quotas will be.

It would be difficult to imagine a more unethical betrayal of the consumers' interests, or a more deliberate insult to the American oil consumer.

Elmer Hoehn is the same man reported by Oil Daily as active in discussions with the Democratic Platform Committee last Fall regarding depletion and oil imports.

Hoehn appears to have proved his effectiveness to the oil industry then.

The 1960 Democratic platform had denounced depletion as a conspicuous loophole that is inequitable. But the 1964 platform—showing the influence of Hoehn—does not mention this most notorious of oil tax loopholes.

UNITED STATES HANDLING OF INDIA-PAKISTAN WAR EXCELLENT TO DATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is always a carload of brickbats thrown at the administration when anything goes wrong with our foreign policy. In the kind of world in which we live, with America as the unquestioned leader of the free world and the pre-eminent military force in the world, this Nation—and specifically the President of this Nation—is blamed for almost everything that happens throughout the world. The India-Pakistan war is no exception.

Thoughtful and careful observers now are coming to agree that the way the President and Secretary of State have handled the India-Pakistan war has won very high marks for professional competence.

Of course, we can never be sure what is going to happen tomorrow or an hour from now, but at present it appears that the quiet, steady, but powerful, influence of this Nation may be the big element in winning a peaceful resolution of the tragic India-Pakistan clash.

In the course of this development, the rough and ready willingness of China to exploit the war has been met by the Johnson administration quietly but very effectively indeed. The consequence for our position in Vietnam as well as elsewhere in Asia, and indeed in the world, has been all to the good.

One of the most thoughtful and perceptive appraisals of this American foreign policy success, an analysis by Joseph Kraft, appeared in this morning's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACEMAKING IN ASIA

(By Joseph Kraft)

Victory a la Hitler and Napoleon, victory that means seized capitals and subdued countries, is not in the cards in the Indian subcontinent. Given the terrain, the size of the forces, and the state of the local art, the worst likely military trouble is intensified fighting ending in the kind of non-end that has characterized almost all frontier struggles in the postwar era.

But there is a serious diplomatic danger that could materialize within a month. It would be possible for Russia to emerge from the present troubles as the dominant diplomatic power in India. China could emerge as the dominant diplomatic power in Pakistan. It is against that awful outcome that American diplomacy must be mobilized.

So far it can be said that the administration has met the test with remarkable sophistication. It has shown a clear appreciation of what has been going on. It has scrupulously avoided panicky reactions and unilateral moves that could only make matters worse. It has even avoided that fatal combination that has been the hallmark of American diplomacy through the decades—the combination of force and unctuous rectitude.

On one side, the Indian side, of the quarrel, this country has for once resisted the temptation to indulge in an orgy of China-baiting. Unlike the Pakistanis, Indians and Russians who have all been doing the kind of things that make the Chinese look 10 feet tall, the United States has been patient and moderate.

The strongest official statement about Chinese intervention made by the United States was a remark made last week by the Secretary of State after giving testimony to the Congress. Because it produced banner headlines of an American warning to Peiping, the statement is worth reproducing in full.

Mr. Rusk was asked about charges that Communist China has been "egging on" the fight on the subcontinent. In a reply of studied mildness, he said: "I think there are those who feel that China is trying to fish in troubled waters here. Our own advice to Peiping would be not to do that and to stay out of it and give the Security Council of the United Nations a chance to settle this matter."

On the other side of the quarrel, the Pakistani side, this country has resisted the itch to make moral judgments about the Kashmir issue. Instead of trying, as the Pakistanis put it, to solve the problem rather than the symptoms, Washington has kept its righteousness under firm control. The closest this country has come to a pronouncement on Kashmir was again the comment made by the Secretary of State after testimony on the Hill last week.

His words were remarkable for measured care. And once again, because they were widely misinterpreted, they are worth citing.

Mr. Rusk was asked about a plebiscite that would achieve self-determination on Kashmir. He said: "We have expressed our views on that subject over the years. That is part of a general problem of solution of outstanding issues between India and Pakistan. We believe that these matters should be taken up and resolved by peaceful means. We do not believe they should be resolved by force."

With this country keeping its tone measured, the Russians and Chinese, far from scoring great gains as the beaky hawks would assert, have overreached themselves. The Chinese, fearful that a settlement of sorts might be in the works, issued their ultimatums in the evident hope of preventing Pakistan from coming to terms. Lacking the capacity for truly serious action on the ground, they have been obliged to extend the ultimatum. It is now not easy to see how they will emerge without a simultaneous loss of prestige, and a new confirmation of their role as chief international troublemaker.

For their part, the Russians, after issuing the kind of warnings bound to incite Peiping, have pulled the grandstand play of calling for a meeting of Indian and Pakistani representatives in Moscow. If it comes off at all, which is extremely doubtful, it is hard to see

how a Moscow meeting can yield concrete results. Far from making the most of an opportunity, the Russians seem merely to be underlining their own limitations. They may end up with egg all over their face.

The lesson here is not simply Milton's homily that "they also serve who only stand and wait"; that, after all, was an ode to blindness. The true lesson, the lesson for those who would see in the dark, is that in this country's contacts with the Chinese Communists, the bellicose reaction is almost always the wrong reaction. The right policy is to turn to account against the Chinese the miasmic political swamps that fringe the Asian heartland. And nowhere is that more true than in that other Asian trouble spot that we all know in our bones is dimly related to the crisis in the subcontinent—Vietnam.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have tried to read all testimony available regarding the situation in the Dominican Republic last spring. Having heard the discussion in the Senate in the course of the debate regarding the judgment, or lack of judgment, of our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Mr. Bennett, Jr., I have reached my own conclusion that the greater weight of the evidence justifies the conclusion that the recent statement of Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, was corroborated and sound.

It is to be noted that following the time Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., made his frantic call to the White House pleading for the immediate sending in of American marines to save American lives, his plea was immediately complied with. Instead of a few thousand marines being sent in to maintain order and save the lives of American civilians, allegedly in danger according to Ambassador Bennett, more than 30,000 men of our Armed Forces were sent in. This would seem almost enough to sink that little island.

I said on May 12, and I consider it a sound statement, that the threat of a Communist takeover was misrepresented and exaggerated. A theatrical touch was added with the statement that our Ambassador, Mr. Bennett, was making his plea from beneath his desk while our Embassy was being fired on. Of course our President is not to be blamed for relying upon the statements of his Ambassador.

It is noteworthy that not one American civilian was killed or wounded in the fighting that took place either before or after Ambassador Bennett made the frantic plea for help. Unfortunately there was fighting between the forces of the military junta and those who were referred to as rebels. The first American killed was a marine who was accidently shot by a fellow marine.

It is noteworthy also that practically all dispatches made public by our State Department and by our President following the initial plea of Ambassador Bennett, Jr. referred to U.S. Ambassadors Martin or Bunker. Ambassador Bunker had apparently taken over. Fortunately, the leader of the junta, Wessin y Wessin, has recently been deported from that unhappy island and is now voicing his complaints from the safety of Florida. Disorder and rioting have ceased, civil authority has been restored. This is all to the good. I am hopeful that free elections in the Dominican Republic will be held as promised.

It is an unfortunate fact that we have in our State Department some officials who seem to denounce as Communists Latin American leaders who take action in opposition to the wealthy economic royalists of any Latin American country. I observed this firsthand while with a factfinding study group in South America for some weeks. Personally, I consider that W. Tapley Bennett, Jr. is one who indicated sympathy for and agreement with leaders of the Dominican junta, and considered the democratic elements and supporters of Juan Bosch as infiltrated or controlled by Communists. There was no justification for that conclusion.

Dr. Juan Bosch, during his 7-month administration as elected president of the Dominican Republic, commenced to give that little island and its people their first experience in democratic government instead of tyranny. He was ousted by a military junta aided by one of the assassins of the despot Trujillo. In Brazil, Venezuela, Chile and other Latin American countries there are those leaders who are seeking to release the people from the stranglehold of absentee landlordism and to break up huge estates and distribute a part of their huge landholdings to the impoverished, underprivileged laborers and peasants and free them from misery and squalor. Even though such expropriation proceedings are proposed by legal action, it appears that some of our Ambassadors to Latin American countries have in the past almost automatically regarded such leaders as Communists or Communist sympathizers. On the basis of evidence I have read, I believe there is clear and convincing proof that Ambassador Bennett, Jr., failed to distinguish between truly democratic elements in the citizenry and the Communist elements. He showed prejudice in favor of the military junta and against democratic elements of the Dominican Republic.

I am convinced that the views of Chairman FULBRIGHT, that the rebel forces were not controlled by Communist elements, are correct. I am convinced that Ambassador Bennett's conclusions lacked justification. Furthermore, as an indication that Chairman FULBRIGHT's conclusions have basis in fact, it is well known that almost immediately our President dispatched as special envoy John Bartlow Martin and a little later Ellsworth Bunker, to take over in the Dominican Republic. Following that time, order was restored. Citizens of the Dominican Republic seem to have confidence in Ambassador's Martin and Bunker when many had apparently lacked confidence in Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr. It is evident that our President felt the same way.

Mr. President, it seems to me irrefutable that our President's reliance, directly after the start of the rioting and the sending in of Marines responding to the plea of Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., upon John Bartlow Martin and Ellsworth Bunker and apparent disregard of Bennett, Jr., is further verification of the soundness of Chairman FULBRIGHT's conclusions. In my opinion our colleague, Chairman FULBRIGHT, had the greater weight of the evidence in support of his conclusions.

Certainly the Dominican Republic is within our sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere. We cannot tolerate any Communist takeover of authority in that little island and I assert there was no evidence of any Castro-like takeover. No Communist was a leader in the revolt. In my judgment there was no preponderance of the evidence available or adduced that such a Communist takeover was even remotely in prospect.

Dan Kurzman, staff writer of the Washington Post, reported that Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno of the so-called rebel forces stated that Ambassador Bennett laughed at him when he asked the Ambassador's help to end the bloodshed. Colonel Caamaño stated he was ready to agree to a cease-fire and to negotiate with the military junta but that Ambassador Bennett refused to mediate and laughed scornfully at him. It is to be noted that Ambassador John Bartlow Martin, directly after his arrival in the Dominican Republic, encouraged mediation efforts between the two factions.

It has seemed to me that there was never an occasion for us to have approximately 30,000 men of our Armed Forces in Santo Domingo. This could be likened to wielding a sledgehammer to drive in a tack.

Fortunately, instead of aiding and abetting General Wessin y Wessin and other junta leaders as apparently was done by Ambassador Bennett at the outset, our policy was reversed, and wisely. Wessin y Wessin is in exile and civilian authority is now in charge.

Very likely more of our Marines will shortly be withdrawn as law and order seem to have been restored. Recognition, although belated, was given to the Organization of American States and small military components of some members of that organization have been and are presently helping uphold civilian authority.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHRYSLER CORP. OF PRICE INCREASE IN 1966 AUTOMOBILES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today I would like to comment on the recent announcement by Chrysler Corp. of price increases for their 1966 model cars.

To me, as one outside the corporation, Chrysler's new price schedule is—in the light of profit figures—both surprising and disturbing. As the table, which I shall ask be made part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, demonstrates, in 1964 the Chrysler Corp. reported profits, after taxes, of $214 million—equal to a return of more than 19 percent of its invested capital. The Ford Motor Co. earned more than half a billion dollars in profits, after taxes. And

the General Motors Corp. reported the greatest profits of any corporation in U.S. history, more than $1.734 billion—equal to a return of 23 percent on its invested capital.

The company cites increased costs of new equipment as the reason for the boost. Certainly everyone applauds the installation of safety equipment on the new car models, and most certainly the present occupant of the chair [Mr. KENNEDY of New York]. But we would not want this to be a smokescreen for unjustified price increases.

In its price increase announcement Chrysler made no mention of increased productivity. That would appear to cancel out at least part of any increases in cost of the added safety features.

Productivity—output per man-hour—in the auto industry is increasing at a very rapid rate—by as much of 5 percent according to some sources, by at least 3.5 percent according to very conservative estimates. This means that the same number of cars can be built this year as a year ago, with somewhere between 3.5 and 5 percent fewer man-hours. The savings in costs per unit of output are obvious.

Another real concern is whether the other auto firms will follow traditional practice and match the increases. In the past the auto companies generally have followed the highest price leader. In 1956, for example, Ford initially announced an average price increase on its 1957 models of 2.9 percent. Two weeks later General Motors increased its 1957 model prices by an average of 6.1 percent. Promptly Ford and Chrysler revised their prices upward to match almost dollar for dollar the higher GM prices.

A demonstration of parallel pricing—in this period of unparalleled profits—would naturally generate increased concern about a lack of price competition within the industry.

If this price pattern is repeated and the other auto firms follow Chrysler's lead, the impact on the consumer and the entire economy could be great. Based on an anticipated sale of 9 million cars in the 1966 model year, a price hike following the lines of the Chrysler announcement—averaging more than $50 a unit—would cost the American consumer half a billion dollars in higher prices.

Further, an increase in car prices viewed in light of recent price rises in other basic industries, could touch off an inflationary spiral.

I need not elaborate on the possible adverse consequences of inflationary moves at this time. But it is a consequence which we must continually be on guard to prevent.

It is true that all the economic factors of this price boost are not yet in. But on the face of it, justification is doubtful at best.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. When General Motors and Ford sit at their respective conference tables to decide how to react to the Chrysler action, I hope that the consumer view will also be heard.

I ask unanimous consent that a statistical table using July's Fortune magazine statistics and a news article from the Wall Street Journal of September 22 be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Profits in the auto industry, 1964

Company	After tax net profit	Profit as percent of invested capital
General Motors	$1,734,782,000	22.8
Ford	505,642,000	12.6
Chrysler	213,770,000	19.1
American Motors	26,227,000	9.4
Average, all industries		10.5

Source: Fortune, July 1965.

MOST OF CHRYSLER PRICE INCREASES EXCEED COST OF ADDED SAFETY ITEMS BY $10 TO $35

Price increases posted by Chrysler Corp. on its 1966 models generally exceed the cost of safety equipment added to the cars by $10 to $35, with most increases in the higher end of the range.

Chrysler announced prices late Monday for cars that go on sale September 30, becoming the first auto company to list 1966 price tags. The company raised base prices on most of its 128 models by 2.1 to 3.6 percent.

There were indications in Detroit that General Motors Corp. also may announce prices soon, although GM's divisions won't put new cars on sale until October 7–14. Ford Motor Co. and American Motors Corp. said they don't expect to announce prices until shortly before they start selling new models, October 1 for Ford and October 7 for AMC. None of the other companies would comment on Chrysler's price increases or their own price plans.

Industry sources were surprised at Chrysler's decision to announce 1966-model prices so early, especially in view of indications from Washington officials that they expected the auto industry to hold the price line. Chrysler said yesterday that it hadn't received any comment from Federal officials on its decision to raise prices.

ADMINISTRATION NONCOMMITTAL FOR NOW

A Washington official said yesterday that unless there's an abrupt change of plans, the Johnson administration expects to remain noncommittal on the Chrysler price changes until late November or early December.

It will take until then, he explained, for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to evaluate the changes in its usual manner as it prepares the consumer price index. The announcement by Chrysler came too late this month to be included in the index of September, he explained, so it will be reflected in the index for October.

Also, the administration has decided it must wait because the Bureau has a long-established procedure for determining to what extent quality improvements offset any increases in auto prices, and because the Bureau is known for being "immune from politics and pressure of all kinds."

REUTHER DENOUNCES ACTION

Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, denounced Chrysler's price increases, charging they had "absolutely no economic justification." He alleged that production efficiency was so high in the auto industry that prices could be cut and still allow the companies "handsome profits."

"If the price increase announced by Chrysler is a forerunner of similar action by the balance of the industry," Mr. Reuther said, the UAW will ask Congress to "initiate a searching investigation of auto costs, prices and profits."

Mr. Reuther hinted strongly that the UAW will urge the Johnson administration to pressure Chrysler and other companies on their pricing plans. "It isn't yet too late to turn back this profiteering assault on the consumer and on national price stability," Mr. Reuther said. "Chrysler can be persuaded to back down if General Motors and Ford refuse to go along, just as U.S. Steel was persuaded to rescind its unjustifiable 1962 price increase" by President Kennedy.

One Congressman attacked Chrysler's price increases yesterday. Noting that the Federal excise tax was reduced from 10 percent to 7 percent last summer, Representative VANIK, Democrat, of Ohio, charged: "It looks as though the auto industry is reneging on its promise of less than a year ago to pass the excise tax reduction on to the American consumer."

The 10-percent factory tax on autos was cut to 7 percent retroactive to May 15 and is to drop to 6 percent next January 1; it is to fall to 4 percent a year later and to 2 percent on January 1, 1968, leveling off at 1 percent on January 1, 1969.

TAX SAVINGS PASSED ALONG

To reserve judgment until the bureau's analysis is completed, more than 2 months hence, could reduce the Government's chances of countering through publicity any price increase that might prove to have occurred. But the matter is too important to warrant "going off half-cocked," as one official put it.

Chrysler maintained, however, that it was continuing to pass along excise tax savings to customers and added that it will also pass along future reductions in the tax which Congress has scheduled.

Price increases were necessitated by the addition of five safety items as standard equipment and certain other improvements in the cars, Chrysler said. The safety items, which previously were offered only as options on most models, added an average of $49 to the retail prices of 1966 cars, Chrysler indicated.

Most of Chrysler's price increases fell in a range from $59 on a typical Valiant compact to $84 on a typical Plymouth. Thus it was indicated that $10 to $35 of the price increases couldn't be attributed to additional safety equipment, which was placed on all cars after congressional prodding.

There were exceptions to the general pattern. Prices of some Dart and Valiant models were increased only by an amount approximately equal to the former optional retail price of currently standard safety equipment. On the other hand, the price of the sporty Barracuda was increased by $103, or more than $50 above the apparent cost of additional safety equipment.

Big Chryslers and Imperials, which carried safety equipment as standard in 1965, will cost $42 to $84 more than in 1965. But bigger engines and certain other features have been made standard in these cars, Chrysler said. On the basis of 1965 optional prices for the larger engines and other than optional features, Chrysler said it has actually cut prices by as much as $152 for a com-

parably equipped Imperial. Based on the company's figuring, some other Chrysler and Imperial models were effectively reduced in price. But prices of some luxury cars were increased by as much as $59, by the company's own figuring.

OTHER COMPANIES' ITEMS

The safety package Chrysler has added to all its cars doesn't include some items other companies have said will be standard on their models. The other three companies will offer the same safety items as Chrysler plus padded sun visors and, in the case of American Motors and Ford, four-way flashing systems for emergency use.

Based on present optional prices, padded visors and flashing systems would add about $25 to the price of a car. Accordingly, if Ford and AMC increase prices for their added safety equipment as expected, they may find that their models are at about the same price level as competitive Chrysler models—but without the $10 to $35 Chrysler will get on most of its models above the price of safety equipment.

Chrysler said it will make padded sun visors standard equipment on all its cars in January; this item costs $5 to $6 as an option. Chrysler and GM will offer flashing systems only as options in 1966; this item costs $19 to $20 as an option.

Chrysler apparently feels the auto market is strong enough to absorb price increases without dampening buyer interest, although in the past Chrysler officials have credited general price stability over the past 6 years as a strong factor in rising sales. But along with other auto companies, Chrysler has said recently that it expects 1966 sales to at least equal this year's record volume.

Chrysler said retail prices of options and accessories remain generally unchanged in 1966.

Following are representative retail prices of Chrysler Corp. cars. They include the 7 percent Federal excise tax for both years and certain other charges, but exclude non-Federal taxes, freight charges and optional equipment.

Chrysler-Plymouth Division

	1965	1966 [1]	Increase
Valiant (compact):			
4-door 200 sedan	$2,167	$2,226	$59
Signet convertible	2,526	2,527	1
Barracuda 2-door hardtop	2,453	2,556	103
Belvedere (intermediate):			
Belvedere I, 2-door sedan	2,198	2,277	79
Belvedere II, 4-door sedan	2,321	2,405	84
Satellite V-8, 2-door hardtop	2,612	2,695	83
Fury (standard):			
Fury I, 2-door	2,348	2,426	78
Fury II, V-8, 4-door sedan	2,604	2,684	80
Fury III, V-8, 4-door sedan	2,753	2,823	70
Chrysler:			
Newport, 4-door sedan	2,968	3,052	84
New Yorker,[2] 2-door hardtop	4,098	4,157	59
Imperial:			
4-door hardtop [2]	5,691	5,733	42

[1] Chrysler-Plymouth 1966 cars include the following items as standard equipment, which were options on most Plymouth models in 1965: Backup lights, outside left rear-view mirrors, padded instrument panels, and variable speed windshield wipers and washers. Chrysler Corp. said the 1965 retail price for these items as options averaged $49, varying from $47.50 to $52.05, depending on the model. The manufacturer's wholesale price was $40.20, according to industry sources.

[2] Chrysler and Imperial cars carried the previously listed items as standard equipment in 1965, but for 1966 certain other items have been added as standard equipment on these models. Chrysler New Yorkers now have a 440-cubic-inch engine as standard equipment replacing a 413-cubic-inch engine. Imperials also have the larger engine, along with reclining seats and integral headrests as standard equipment.

NOTE.—All cars sold in California will carry an antismog device as standard equipment in compliance with State law. The devices will increase base price of 6-cylinder cars by $18 and 8-cylinder cars by $25, Chrysler Corp. said.

Dodge Division

	1965	1966 [1]	Increase
Dart (compact):			
4-door sedan	$2,112	$2,158	$46
270 4-door station wagon	2,472	2,533	61
GT V-8 hardtop	2,500	2,545	45
Coronet (intermediate):			
4-door sedan	2,227	2,302	75
Deluxe 4-door station wagon	2,556	2,631	75
440 convertible	2,586	2,672	86
Polara (standard):			
318 4-door sedan	2,695	2,763	68
4-door hardtop	2,874	2,948	74
Monaco (called Custom 880 in 1965):			
2-door hardtop	3,043	3,107	64

[1] Dodge 1966 cars include the following items as standard equipment, which were options on most Dodge models in 1965: Backup lights, outside left-hand rear-view mirror, padded instrument panel and variable speed wipers and washers. Chrysler Corp. said the 1965 retail price for these items as options averaged $49, varying from $47.50 to $52.05, depending on the model. The manufacturer's wholesale price was $40.20, according to industry sources.

NOTE.—All cars sold in California will carry an antismog device as standard equipment in compliance with State law. The devices will increase base prices of 6-cylinder cars by $18 and 8-cylinder cars by $25, Chrysler Corp. said.

BIG BROTHER: IRS SNOOPING

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to some recent newspaper articles which I think indicate a growing public awareness of the big brotherism which threatens our freedoms.

I welcome this growing awareness, Mr. President. I think the American people are beginning to realize what some of the agents in the IRS and the FDA and some of our other Government agencies are up to. And when enough of them realize that, I think they are going to demand that we do something about it.

The first of these articles is an excerpt from the very fine statement of Dr. William M. Beaney, a professor of political science and law at Princeton University, printed in the June 17, 1965, issue of the Newark Evening News.

The second article, by Mr. Robert Waters, is from the Hartford, Conn., Courant of August 2, 1965. It reports that U.S. Attorney Jon O. Newman has instructed Federal law-enforcement agencies in Connecticut to obey the Federal ban on wiretapping and to limit their bugging activities to those types permitted by law. This is an admirable step in the right direction and I want to commend Mr. Newman for it; but I would also point out that it is a sad state of affairs when Federal agencies must be reminded to obey the law.

Finally, I have three articles from the Chicago papers, all dealing with the same case. In this recent case, a Federal judge dismissed indictments against two men alleged to be gamblers because the Internal Revenue Service had used one of its electronic snooping devices to obtain evidence against them. Now, the IRS has been saying that the hearings of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure have been hurting the organized crime drive. I think these articles indicate that one thing that hinders the organized crime drive is the illegal and unconstitutional tactics used by IRS agents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, July 30, 1965]

BOOKIE INDICTMENTS VOIDED—PHONE SNOOPER HELD ILLEGAL

A Federal judge delivered a blow to the Government's war on bookies Thursday as he dismissed two indictments on the ground that they were based on evidence gathered by a telephone snooper device.

Freed were Nick Guglielmo, 34, of 4824 West Rice, and Joseph B. (Joey D.) Delmonico, 46, of 5918 Park, Cicero.

They were arrested August 21, 1964, in a basement at 2501 South Gunderson, Berwyn, which raiding authorities said was a wire-room center. They were charged with failure to possess Federal wagering stamps and failure to register as bookmakers.

Chief Judge William J. Campbell, of U.S. district court, ruled the use of a pen register system by the Illinois Bell Telephone Co. to record the dial pulses of all telephone numbers called from a phone in the basement was a violation of the Federal Communications Act.

FIRST COURT RULING

A phone company spokesman said Judge Campbell's ruling was the first of its kind. Though the pen register system had been used to develop hundreds of cases, the company's legal department was unaware, he said, of any pending cases that might be affected by the decision.

U.S. Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan declined immediate comment. The pen register has been used by State as well as Federal authorities to obtain search warrants for raids.

The phone company emphasized that the pen register is a recording device at the central office which cuts out after the dialing process is completed, without indicating whether or not the call was completed.

It is used in the regular course of business, the spokesman said, to trade lewd and nuisance calls and to further the company's studies of traffic. It was developed originally to test the dialing accuracy of subscribers using dial phones for the first time.

ACT'S PROVISIONS CITED

Judge Campbell, in issuing his ruling which threw out the indictments, said the Federal Communications Act provides:

"No person transmitting any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect or meaning thereof, except through authorized channels, to any person other than the person called."

"This language," said Judge Campbell, "is clear and unequivocal. The existence of a communication was divulged (in this case) without the consent of the sender or other party to the call."

Without the use of the snooper device, the judge added, "it is clear * * * no warrant would have been issued, and no indictment would have been returned.

"The fruits of such a violation are, of course, inadmissible in evidence, much as proper investigation and alert detection of crime should be encouraged."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, July 30, 1965]

TWO GAMBLERS FREED BECAUSE IRS SNOOPED

Federal indictments against two Chicago gamblers were dismissed Thursday because

the Internal Revenue Service obtained evidence against them through the use of a telephone snooping device.

Chief Judge William J. Campbell of the U.S. district court dismissed the indictments against Nick Guglielmo, 34, of 4824 West Rice and Joseph DelMonico, 46, of 5918 Park Avenue, Cicero.

They had been arrested in a cleanup, August 21, of 10 major wire rooms and were charged with failing to possess Federal wagering stamps and with failing to register as bookmakers.

Judge Campbell held that the IRS had obtained information against the two after the tax agency asked Illinois Bell Telephone Co. to place a "pen register" on a phone line that the IRS suspected was being used for bet taking.

A "pen register," sometimes called a dial pulse register, is a device clamped on the wire feeding a telephone subscriber's phone to record all telephone numbers dialed from the phone.

Judge Campbell's ruling came after a hearing April 5 on a motion by the defense to suppress the evidence because it was obtained through use of the device.

Edward J. Calihan and Anna Lavin, attorneys for the defendants, contended at the hearing that use of the pen register violated the Federal Communications Act, which provides that "no person * * * shall divulge or publish the existence" of phone calls except to a telephone subscriber who requests such information.

"The language of this statute is clear and unequivocal," Judge Campbell said in his written ruling.

"The existence of a communication was divulged without the consent of the sender or other party to the call."

DISMISSED FOR PHONE BUGS

The U.S. Solicitor General will be asked Friday to order an appeal of a decision that freed two accused gamblers because the Internal Revenue Service used electronic snooping devices on their telephone.

U.S. Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan said he will submit a report on the decision, handed down Thursday by Chief Judge William J. Campbell of the U.S. district court here, and a request that the decision be appealed.

Hanrahan said that he will ask the Government's highest ranking civil law attorney, Acting Solicitor General Ralph Spritzer, "as soon as paperwork is completed sometime Friday."

Judge Campbell handed down a written order Thursday dismissing indictments against the two men, who were arrested in an IRS raid on an alleged horse-betting parlor in Berwyn.

Nick Guglielmo, 34, of 4824 West Rice, and Joseph DelMonico, 46, of 5918 Park, Cicero, had been charged with failing to possess a Federal wagering stamp and with failing to register as bookmakers.

Judge Campbell held that the IRS got the information used to obtain indictments against the men by using a "pen register."

The device, when clipped on the wire feeding a telephone, records the numbers of all outgoing calls.

Judge Campbell held that use of the device violated the Federal Communications Act, which provides that "no person * * * shall divulge or publish the existence" of telephone calls except to a telephone subscriber who requests such information.

"It is clear that but for the above described violation * * * no warrant would have issued, and no indictment would have returned," he ruled.

"The indictments against the defendants tied ineluctably (inescapably) with the illegal wiretapping must be and accordingly are hereby dismissed."

Hanrahan said that if a higher court reverses Judge Campbell's ruling, "the door will be open to reindict Guglielmo and DelMonico."

He said that on June 1, Judge Campbell handed down an oral ruling in the case that dismissed charges against the two men.

"I was under the impression that the judge merely disallowed the evidence obtained through the use of the pen register," Hanrahan said.

"It was not until I read the written ruling handed down Thursday that I realized the judge had dismissed the indictments against these two men."

Campbell said he had decided to issue a written order after he had handed down the oral ruling because the IRS use of wiretapping and other snooper devices has since become the subject of a Senate subcommittee investigation and hearing.

[From the Evening News, Newark, N.J., June 17, 1965]

CONSTITUTION AND RIGHT OF PRIVACY—PRINCETON PROFESSOR FINDS FOUR AMENDMENTS LIMIT INVASION

(NOTE.—The following is from a statement by Dr. William M. Beaney, professor of political science and Cromwell professor of law at Princeton University, before a recent Washington session of the House subcommittee investigating invasion of privacy.)

In many ways, the term privacy is an unfortunate way of capsulizing an effort to define limits on the intervention of governmental and nongovernmental actions into the affairs of individual citizens or their lawful associations. There is a coldness, an antiseptic quality associated with the term that fails to convey its importance as an individual and social value.

I think that the great Justice Brandeis came closest to identifying the true nature of privacy as a right in his famous Harvard Law Review article, written in collaboration with Charles Warren, published in 1890, and in his powerful dissent in the Olmstead case in 1928.

In his article, Brandeis thought that the prying of scandal-mongering newspapers into the private social life of prominent citizens violated their right to privacy. Although the authors seem in retrospect to have given insufficent weight to the values and traditions that surround freedom of press, their sensitive and imaginative perception of the threats to privacy arising from "the intensity and complexity of modern life" and their call for legal protection through legislation and court action mark the beginning of serious awareness of the problem. The tort of privacy has now been recognized in a majority of States and there have been over 350 decided cases involving the civil wrong of invasion privacy.

SLOW EVOLUTION

But of greater significance, in my opinion, is the slow, halting evolution of a constitutional right to privacy stimulated by Brandeis' prophetic opinion in dissent in Olmstead. You will recall that this case arose out of the Federal Government's efforts to convict a large-scale bootlegger in the State of Washington, and specifically, the use of evidence obtained by the tapping of his telephone line, this in a State which had a law forbidding wiretapping. By a 5 to 4 vote the majority of the U.S. Supreme Court held that wiretapping was not an unreasonable search and seizure, and hence not prohibited by the fourth amendment.

While Holmes, dissenting, decried the role of the Federal authorities in the dirty business of breaking State law, Brandeis, dissenting, stressed what to me is clearly the proper principle in interpreting constitutional grants of power and limitations in power.

Pointing out that the Court had construed powers broadly to meet conditions unanticipated by the framers, he argued that "clauses guaranteeing to the individual protection against specific abuses of power must have a similar capacity of adaptation to a changing world."

Decrying the narrow, mechanical approach of the majority, Brandeis argued that the framers "recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect * * * they sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man."

WOULD BE STRICT

Brandeis concluded that "to protect that right, every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the fourth amendment."

In research which is not yet completed, I have tried to show that if "freedom to travel" is part of liberty, "the right of privacy," a guarantee against unjustifiable intrusion into one's thoughts, emotions, sensations—the right to be let alone unless there is a rational and important countervailing interest—can be spelled out of a combination of several clauses of the Constitution, including the 1st, the 4th, the 5th and the 14th amendments.

And one can make a good case that a freedom from unjustifiable intrusion is central to the very notion of a constitutional order in which the importance and dignity of every individual is central, in a political system based on the concept of Government derived from the consent of the governed.

But wholly apart from the constitutional basis (or assuming for the moment that there is no constitutional basis of a right to privacy), I would suggest that a government devoted to freedom and recognizing the dignity and importance of every individual should seek to safeguard all reasonable claims to privacy against private invasions, should avoid intrusive action on its own part, except where strong justification existed.

I am not suggesting a once-and-for-all definition of the rights nor is it appropriate to catalog all the possible claims that can be made and which may deserve protection. What is required is an inventory of the activities of public and private agencies that raise privacy and dignity issues, in each instance the justification for the intrusive action should be made explicit so that it may be evaluated, while at the same time alternative, less intrusive measures may be substituted.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Aug. 2, 1965]

HEADS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES IN STATE INSTRUCTED TO OBEY WIRETAPPING BAN

(By Robert Waters)

The heads of all Federal law enforcement agencies in Connecticut have been instructed to obey the Federal ban on wiretapping and limit eavesdropping by electronic "bugging" to only that type permitted by law.

U.S. Attorney Jon O. Newman, the chief Federal prosecutor in Connecticut, in a memorandum effective today, urged the top Federal law enforcement men to guard against violations of defendants' rights that might jeopardize otherwise valid convictions.

In what may be the first reaction of its type in the Nation, Newman told the agency heads that the recent disclosures before a congressional subcommittee of illicit "bugging" and wiretapping in Boston and Pittsburgh "demonstrates that instances of im-

propriety can happen in well-run and well-supervised offices."

The Federal prosecutor said he was certain that the policies of each agency in Connecticut are designed to guard against improper investigations but he warned that even isolated cases of failing to observe the legal limits brings the risk of discredit to all law enforcement activities.

Newman's directive contained three main points:

First. There must be no wiretapping "unless and until Congress sees fit to make any changes" in the statutes.

Second. Eavesdropping through electronic bugging must not violate the rule of "no technical trespass" into the premises under surveillance.

Third. No attempt must be made to overhear surreptitiously conversations between a suspect and his lawyer.

The "no technical trespass" rule, as interpreted in Federal court decisions, usually means that electronic listening devices must be outside the premises under surveillance.

Newman cited the Goldman case in the Supreme Court in 1943 which is still regarded as the basic law in this area. The case permitted agents to overhear a conversation from an adjoining room through a listening device that was hung on the wall of the agent's room.

CITES NEW CASE

In a new case this year, Newman also pointed out that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2d Circuit, which includes Connecticut, gave its blessing to an investigation where agents taped a microphone over the keyhole of a common door between two hotel rooms after the metal plate covering the keyhole had been swung aside.

The judges deciding this new case included U.S. Circuit Judge J. Joseph Smith and U.S. District Judge M. Joseph Blumenfeld, both of Hartford.

In citing the permissible limits of bugging, Newman observed:

"Detection of criminal activities is a difficult task that requires a variety of investigative techniques including visual and aural surveillance. The fact that a person's privacy must be invaded is not sufficient reason for curtailing investigation of crime. The right of privacy is not a sanctuary for the concealment of crime."

The memorandum has been sent to agency heads of the FBI, the Secret Service, the Intelligence Division of the Internal Revenue Service, the Postal Inspection Service, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the IRS, Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. marshals.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ERVIN BY THE FEDERAL BAR NEWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am happy to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate a richly deserved tribute paid by the Federal Bar News to Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., the senior Senator from North Carolina.

This tribute outlines the numerous accomplishments of Senator ERVIN during his many years of dedicated public service, and deals specifically with his "outstanding accomplishments in the field of citizens' rights under the U.S. Constitution."

The concluding paragraph of the Federal Bar News article perhaps sums up the feeling his colleagues have for Senator ERVIN's diligent and unselfish performance of his duty to the Senate, the country, and to his beloved Constitution. It reads:

Of this dedicated lawyer, jurist, legislator, and patriot it can truly be said he is an example of the fulfillment of the late President Kennedy's admonition to us all: Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.

I know that this tribute will come as no surprise to the Members of the Senate. We recognize Senator ERVIN's great ability and we are guided constantly by his wise counsel. He is indeed an eminent lawyer, a dedicated public servant, and a great humanitarian. He is an American of whom we are all proud. As we know, Senator ERVIN serves as a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

It is indeed appropriate that the Federal Bar News should choose the outstanding constitutional lawyer of the Senate as the first Member of Congress to be honored in this manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Honorable SAM J. ERVIN, U.S. Senator—Lawyer, Jurist, and Legislator," which appeared in the January 1965 issue of the Federal Bar News be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HONORABLE SAM J. ERVIN, U.S. SENATOR—LAWYER, JURIST, AND LEGISLATOR

(A sketch by the Federal Bar News editor)

SAM J. ERVIN, JR., chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is identified in the minds of those familiar with his career as one of the foremost constitutional lawyers in the country. Born in Morganton, N.C., on September 27, 1896, Senator ERVIN later received his undergraduate degree (A.B.) from the University of North Carolina (1917) and his bachelor of laws (LL.B.) from Harvard Law School (1922). He was admitted to the North Carolina Bar in 1919 and practiced law in Morganton until present except for periods of service on the bench.

During the First World War the Senator served in France with the 1st Division. He was twice wounded in battle, twice cited for gallantry in action, and awarded the French Fourragere, the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Service Cross.

The people of Burke County, N.C., chose him as their representative to the North Carolina Legislature, 1923, 1925, and 1931.

His distinguished career as a jurist began in 1935 when he served as judge on the Burke County criminal court from 1935 to 1937; from 1937 to 1943 he served as judge, North Carolina superior court. His talents and dedication to the law were recognized in his appointment on February 3, 1948, as an Associate Justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court. He continued on the bench until June 11, 1954, when he qualified as a U.S. Senator from North Carolina under appointment of Gov. William B. Umstead. Senator ERVIN was returned to the U.S. Senate at the elections of 1954, 1956, and 1962 for additional terms ending on January 3, 1969.

Prior to his service on the State supreme court, he served as a member of the North Carolina State Board of Law Examiners (1944–46) as a representative to the U.S. Congress, 79th Congress, 1946–47; as chairman of the North Carolina Commission for the Improvement of the Administration of Justice (1947–49).

As a legislator Senator ERVIN has gained national prominence principally for his outstanding achievements in the field of citizens' rights under the U.S. Constitution. As chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee the Senator has conducted public hearings, field studies, investigations, and background research in five major areas relating to constitutional rights: (1) the rights of persons subject to military jurisdiction; (2) rights of the American Indian; (3) rights of the mentally ill; (4) literacy tests and other voting requirements; and (5) the regard for the rights in the administration of criminal justice.

Areas of particular significance to lawyers with which his subcommittee has been concerned are current rules and practices governing arrest, detention, investigation, bail, discovery, venue, and right to counsel. A result of this study prompted the Senator to introduce three bail bills in the 88th Congress, which were again introduced in the 89th Congress, which would carry the war on poverty to the field of administration of criminal justice. "Present bail laws," declared Senator ERVIN, "discriminate against the poor in violation of the spirit of the sixth amendment which prohibits excessive bail. Presently, only the defendant who has money can be free before his trial to prepare his defense. Such antiquated laws, to my mind, contradict our heritage of equal justice under law."

Another area of special interest to lawyers is his inquiry into the right to counsel in proceedings of the various Federal agencies. All agencies submitted replies to his request for their practices in this respect which the committee has under study. It might be noted, in this context, that the Senator praised the Federal Trade Commission for a recent change in its rules to guarantee the right of witnesses to be represented by counsel at the Commission's hearings.

The Senator has also championed the cause of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia by sponsoring a measure, which resulted from a 3-year study by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, and which was signed by the President last September. In describing the purpose of the bill the Senator stated: "The purpose of the bill is to encourage voluntary hospitalization, to define and protect the rights of patients, and to insure that there is no stigma attached to the fact that a person has been hospitalized for a mental illness." He continued: "Under present District law, a patient automatically becomes legally incompetent and loses his rights when he is committed to a hospital for treatment."

Attorneys should also be made aware of the Senator's cosponsorship of a bill to authorize all attorneys, licensed in their home State, to practice before administrative agencies without separate admission by the agency involved.

Neither the last nor the least of his zealous pursuit of the means to safeguard individual liberties is his current inquiry into Federal employees rights in firings, hirings, and personnel practices.

Of this dedicated lawyer, jurist, legislator, and patriot it can truly be said he is an example of the fulfillment of the late President Kennedy's admonition to us all, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what can you do for your country."

THE RECENT CIVIL DISTURBANCES IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, much has been written and said about the recent violent disturbances in Los Angeles,

but I think nowhere have such unfortunate occurrences been put in better perspective than they were in a statement of Prince Hall Grand Masters, made in San Francisco, Calif., in August 1965.

Amos T. Hall, a good friend and a good man, has relayed this statement to me.

Believing that it will be of interest to all Senators, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PRINCE HALL GRAND MASTERS, AUGUST 1965, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Prince Hall Masonry with a membership of approximately one-half million, reaffirms its historical position of protest in seeking to eliminate the inequities of citizenship and every form of discrimination from the American scene.

We deplore the recent violent disturbances which have resulted in the loss of lives and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property in cities of the United States without regard to sectional location.

We direct attention to the courageous leadership of President Johnson, which has resulted in the enactment of advanced civil rights legislation by the Congress of the United States and to his expressions and proclamations regarding the public acceptance of the fact that all citizens of our Nation are entitled to, and should have, equal protection and application of the law, irrespective of their race, color, or religious affiliations.

We call upon every Prince Hall Mason as a leader in his community to use his influence to keep this protest nonviolent as he strives to eliminate injustice and discrimination. We urge that violence be avoided and solutions sought within the framework of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

AQUIA QUARRY REVISITED

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the attached editorial from the Richmond News Leader of September 21, 1965, entitled "Aquia Quarry Revisited."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Sept. 21, 1965]

AQUIA QUARRY REVISITED

Last week we reported on the strange tactics of those who were asserting that George Washington, the Father of his Country, was a common crooked politician. The story was that he had finessed a little deal to gyp the Federal Government by selling second-rate Aquia stone for building the U.S. Capitol. But ever-alert researchers up at Mount Vernon had quickly shown from letters that Washington never owned the quarry at Aquia Creek; and that in fact the Federal Government bought the quarry outright from other owners and cut the stone itself.

Today the mail brings to hand a year-old issue of Lawyers Title News, giving a complete history of the ownership of the Aquia quarry—and its confused tangle of titles. The article backs up the Mount Vernon research with the expert legal scholarship of an associate counsel for Lawyers Title Insurance Co., Marvin C. Bowling, Jr. It's clear from Mr. Bowling's study that Washington had nothing to do with the quarry.

Lawyers Title got into the problem a couple of years ago, when after a routine search, it insured a seemingly perfect title to the island where the quarry is located. The abstract showed an unbroken title running back to the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1877. At that time, the State had granted the island to two individuals on a land office warrant. The overgrown quarry which provided stone for the U.S. Capitol and the White House was forgotten and undetected. Then one day the new, 20th century owner discovered signs on the island warning: "U.S. Government property—keep off." Soon an official advertisement appeared indicating that the land would be sold by the General Services Administration at public auction.

The supposed owner grew alarmed. Lawyers Title was appalled. After running down a number of U.S. Government agencies that handle property, Mr. Bowling finally found the right one. Yes, they had a title, officials explained; it went straight back to Charles II, and the U.S. Government had the paper to prove it.

In 1678, the island was granted by the "Governor and Captain General of Virginia" to two individuals who had performed services for the King. The next instrument, dated 1694, stated that the first grant was void; the new instrument transferred the land to a George Brent. And the grantors were the successors to the original proprietors, the successors being Margaret Lady Culpeper, Thomas Lord Fairfax, Catherine, his wife, and Alexander Culpeper, Esq. Thus the interest in the property went back all the way to the original grant of the entire Northern Neck to the Culpepers in 1669. For upon the death of Lord Culpeper, his interest became vested in his daughter Catherine, wife of Lord Fairfax. The family then sold to Brent.

The property remained in the Brent family, famous Catholic recusants from Maryland, for 97 years. In 1791, another George Brent conveyed the island to Peter Charles L'Enfant—the man who laid out the terrifying complexity of Washington streets—for 1,800 pounds. The title was confirmed in the name of the trustees for the commissioners appointed to establish a "seat of government of the United States." The stone was cut, the Capitol built, the quarry abandoned, and the very ownership of the island forgotten. Many records in the Stafford County courthouse were destroyed by Union soldiers. And in 1877, the State of Virginia, blissfully unaware that it possessed no right to the land, granted it anew.

Through the peculiar precedence of royal and Federal sovereignty, Lawyers Title's client lost the land, and was left with the proceeds of the title insurance. Eventually the GSA disposed of the historical plot of land as surplus. Despite the complexity of the ownership of the quarry, it is evident that George Washington's detractors have no title to their false claim.

PLIGHT OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 19, American Jews assembled in Lafayette Park across from the White House to call world attention to the plight of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

The Jews of that country are subjected to discrimination. Like other peoples in the Soviet Union, they are regarded as a nationality group. They are named as Jews on their passports. But they are not permitted the rights accorded to other nationalities. Their schools, their theater, their culture, their books, their learning, their newspapers—all these have disappeared. For almost half a century, ever since the Soviet revolution of 1917, this great community, which was once a reservoir of learning for world Jewry, has been cut away and isolated from Jews of other lands, from its own historic pact. Gradually, but inexorably, it will be cut away from its identity and it will cease to exist.

Officials of our own country are aware of this injustice and have joined with the American Jewish community in appeals to the Soviet Union for a rectification of this wrong. Our own body has spoken twice on this subject during the last 2 years and, during the last few months, President Lyndon B. Johnson has twice expressed his own views publicly.

Last Sunday, on September 19, as Jews began a vigil in Lafayette Park to attest their concern and to protest against the gradual disappearance of the Jewish people of the Soviet Union, the President addressed a message to that demonstration, and I ask unanimous consent that the President's message be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1965.

I greet my fellow Americans of all faiths gathered today in a vigil for Soviet Jewry. Your cause is the cause of all men who value freedom.

History demonstrates that the treatment of minorities is a barometer by which to measure the moral health of a society. Just as the condition of the American Jew is a living symbol of American achievement and promise, so the conditions of Jewish life and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union reveal fundamental contradictions between the stated principles and the actual practices of the Soviet system.

I once again express my hope for an end to the restrictive practices which prevent Soviet Jews from the full enjoyment of their heritage. I join all men everywhere who through vigilance maintain freedom's eternal light.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD, a statement prepared by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

There can be little doubt that the pending immigration bill is not nearly so objectionable as it was when it was first introduced as an administration measure at the begin-

ning of the year. However, I remain opposed to its enactment because I do not believe that in the long run it will promote the general welfare of the United States. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that if we enact this proposed legislation, we will be adding unnecessary weight to the burdens that will have to be borne by future generations of Americans.

A number of basic changes were made in the bill before it was passed by the House of Representatives. These changes, along with other additional amendments made by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, have made it an entirely different measure from the one that was recommended in the President's January 13 message to Congress. The bill's provisions regarding basic changes in the quota system were drastically altered. The provisions for a Presidential commission, which would eventually have been responsible for formulating immigration policy, I am glad to say, have been deleted. Stronger controls against immigration that would displace American workers from their jobs and adversely affect wages and working conditions in this country have been incorporated into the bill. These are noteworthy improvements, but they do not, in my opinion, justify the bill's enactment.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

Under the provisions of this bill, the volume of immigration into this country would be bound to significantly increase. The estimates that have been made concerning the size of this increase vary from 60,000 to 100,000 or more. Considering that an average of 300,000 immigrants have been admitted annually in recent years, this means that we will have upwards of 400,000 immigrants a year under the bill.

I do not believe that it is wise for us to be increasing immigration at the present time. Notwithstanding its provisions, which are supposed to safeguard domestic workers, this bill will increase the size of our labor force, both immediately and even more markedly in the years ahead when the younger immigrants and the offspring of those admitted reach working age.

Moreover, I am not at all assured that the intended safeguards of workers in this country will prove effective with respect to the immigrant to whom they are intended to apply. Frankly, I see nothing but a tremendous bureaucratic nightmare in attempting to put these provisions into effect. Under the bill, a job clearance would be required for each individual applicant for an immigration visa, stating that the applicant will not displace a qualified American worker or have any adverse effect on wages and working conditions of domestic workers. The job clearance would be required for every immigrant except those granted preference under the bill by reason of their relationship to a U.S. citizen or an alien admitted for permanent residence.

The enactment of these provisions would, in my opinion, cast an impossible burden upon the Labor Department if it is to administer them effectively. Imagine, if we will, the involved decisions that would have to be made in applying these restrictions to thousands upon thousands of prospective immigrants each year. In my opinion, the provisions are utterly unworkable and give every indication of being inserted in the bill merely to provide an answer to those who would raise questions concerning the bill's effects on our labor market.

Each generation of Americans has a responsibility to those that will follow after it. That responsibility is now ours, to leave our children and their children a country in which to live which will be free of any difficulties or problems of our making that we ourselves would not want to face.

I firmly believe that if we enact this proposed legislation increasing immigration, we will be abdicating this responsibility for the shortsighted and transient goals of political expediency. Many of the social and economic problems we face today may well be inconsequential in comparison to those of future generations with our vastly expanding populations.

Certainly, it is impossible to say at what precise point a country becomes overpopulated. This does not mean, however, that we cannot clearly recognize when we are faced with population problems. I believe we are facing them now. We have reached a point when our water resources are being taxed severely in order to meet present needs in many parts of the country, for example. Many of our rivers and streams have become polluted to the degree that they no longer afford the recreational facilities, or meet the needs for domestic and industrial water consumption that they did just a few years ago. One of the Great Lakes, we are told, is now in the process of dying from such pollution. New York and other cities in New England and Middle Atlantic States are now experiencing the serious problems that arise from lack of clean, fresh water. Water problems are numerous in my area of the country. In the face of such problems like these, and others, I feel that we must move most cautiously in considering legislation which would add stimulus to the pace of our population growth.

There are several provisions of the bill which I would support, but not at the expense of increasing the volume of immigration, which would be the major effect of its enactment. I strongly support, for example, the abolishment of the Asia-Pacific triangle which has been especially discriminatory. I also lend my support to the committee amendment to the bill providing a numerical limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration. I do not view this amendment as an affront to our Western Hemisphere neighbors. I doubt that in their mature judgment they would view it as such either. The family reunification and skill requirement provisions of the bill are most meritorious.

It is evident that the national origins quota system has in some ways been discriminatory, and that it has not always worked as it was intended to. These claims, of course, have some merit, but that does not justify enactment, in my opinion, of legislation to greatly increase the numbers of immigrants that will be admitted into the country. Certainly, it is possible to reform the basic law without increasing immigration. That is what I would prefer to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, just 4 years ago today on September 22, 1961, President John F. Kennedy approved Public Law 87-293, the Peace Corps Act. This historic measure, which was enacted with overwhelming Democratic and Republican support in both Houses of Congress, has continued to justify the hopes and the dreams of those who gave it their faith.

Peace Corps volunteers are now located in 46 countries. At the end of the 1964 program year the Peace Corps had 10,494 volunteers and trainees in service. At the end of the August 31, 1965, program year, the Peace Corps had 12,000 volunteers and trainees in service. Legislation recently approved by Congress will authorize 15,110 volunteers and trainees by August 31, 1966. An overwhelming number of these trainees are devoting themselves to education. Others are helping in community action, agriculture, and health among others.

The example they have set by personal conduct has truly demonstrated that Americans are a helpful and compassionate people. The spirit of 1776 as exemplified in the Declaration of Independence called upon our people "to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitled them." That declaration held the following truths to be self-evident that:

All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Peace Corps volunteers have sought to bring this hope of 1776 to the developing nations of 1965. And they are succeeding. In Afghanistan when the Peace Corps first went to help the people there they were limited to 15 volunteers—9 actually went—located only in the capital city of Kabul. We now have 190 Peace Corps volunteers there serving in many parts of that land. In Colombia Peace Corps volunteers are producing educational television programs which are bringing the benefits of education and culture to many people of that land.

The projects are innumerable and worthwhile, but it is the spirit and representations which these Americans, men and women, young and old, make for a free way of life that is most meaningful. They do not live in Embassy compounds. They do not shop at the PX. They live with the people. They eat their food. They share their life as they work to understand and help them help themselves.

When the Peace Corps started with the verve and enthusiasm which it combined, many Washington cynics thought that it would not be long before the Peace Corps went the way of all bureaucracy and became encrusted in bureaucratic procedure and staid in outlook. Despite great expansion to the point of where 8,600 are now in training and a little less than 10,000 are now abroad—and Congress has completely endorsed this expansion—the Peace Corps has not become stultified. Indeed, what other Government agency in the history of this country or, indeed, in the history of any country in the world, has ever successfully sought legislation which would limit to 5 years an individual's eligibility to remain with the Peace Corps professional staff? The Peace Corps has. That is exactly what S. 2054, which was approved by the President on August 24, 1965, did in amending the Peace Corps

Act. Congress provided, at the Peace Corps' request, that those in higher grades than GS–8 be restricted to appointments which may not exceed a total of 5 years. I like the language of the Senate report where it stated as follows:

For some time the Peace Corps has been considering the desirability of a personnel system which would place the Peace Corps staff in essentially the same position as that of the volunteer; serving for a limited period of time and then moving on to give the same opportunity of service to others. The application of Foreign Service Act authorities to the Washington staff would permit a constant inflow of new blood and ideas by allowing administrative flexibility which is not possible under the restrictions of the civil service system.

I like to think that the spirit of modernization which the Peace Corps has brought to many emerging lands will perhaps infuse the public and private bureaucracies of our own Nation so that the hopes and needs of people will be met with expedition. I hope we can look back on future anniversaries and note that this was done. Perhaps the contribution made by the Peace Corps to the conduct of American foreign policy was best summed up in a letter I received from a young Californian, not a member of the Peace Corps, who spent his summer in various Latin American countries. He said:

Senator, one Peace Corps volunteer in my judgment is worth $500,000 of American aid.

I close by saying that as an American citizen I am intensely gratified that these young people have dedicated themselves to the American system in promoting freedom and the cause of decency and justice all around this melancholy globe.

FEDERAL-STATE TAX-SHARING PLAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I was intensely interested in the comments made by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with respect to his specific proposal by which the Government would pay to the States of the Union certain of the revenues coming into the Federal Treasury under Federal revenue statutes.

I applaud and salute the careful manner in which the Senator developed his subject as a basis for introducing legislation on the matter when he spoke yesterday before the New York State County Officers Association at the Hotel Astor in New York City.

This morning the great Capital newspaper, the Washington Post, editorially commended the Senator on the subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address which Senator JAVITS delivered yesterday in New York, together with a copy of the editorial comments in the Washington Post and a column in that same newspaper by Frank Porter on the subject, all be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TAX SHARING WITH THE STATES

(Address by Senator JAVITS)

Before the end of the current congressional session, I intend to introduce legislation implementing a tax-sharing plan to distribute to the States, and through them to local government, a portion of Federal tax revenues.

The general outlines of a proposal to distribute Federal tax revenues to the States was first imprinted on the consciousness of official Washington in 1961 by Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of President's Council of Economic Advisers. I think it is now generally agreed that some form of Federal assistance to State and local government is necessary, but there has been a lack of serious discussion. Despite the administration's reported acceptance of its basic principles and the fact that a Presidential study of the problems involved was submitted to the White House about a year ago, nothing concrete has been done about it.

The problem, of course, is that while this plan sounds uncomplicated and on first mention receives widespread acceptance, it is in reality extremely complex, and every aspect of its implementation contains the seeds of controversy. Nevertheless, I feel that the Congress should have before it a carefully drawn proposal embodying this plan. Debate should begin, and decisions should be made on a tax-sharing plan before State and local governments become completely inundated in the flood of demands for new services and facilities, particularly in the fields of health, education, and welfare. This would weaken further State and local government's ability to cope with these problems and impair irretrievably the opportunity and authority of local government.

The proposal I will offer would include:

1. Establishment of a trust fund in which 1 percent of the current individual income tax base would be deposited. Under present conditions this would amount to about $2.5 billion a year, and it would grow regularly through the years as the tax base grows. Experience has shown that only Federal taxing sources can practically provide the necessary added resources for State and local government because of the economic competition between the States which is growing more acute daily.

Where would the money come from? The fact is that at present tax rates, Federal revenues grow by about $6 billion a year along with the growth of our dynamic economy. With continued economic expansion, this amount will grow larger with the years. We need to make constructive use of this dividend, otherwise it could act as a fiscal drag on the economy by siphoning off larger and larger amounts of purchasing power from the private sector and blunting our driver to reach full employment.

I believe that the appropriate use for these increasing revenues can be found in further tax cuts, in meeting the pressing needs for increased Federal programs, in debt reduction, and by a plan, such as this one, to return a portion to our hard-pressed State and local governments. In addition, careful planning would be, and should, permit a part of the dividend to be used for reducing the present deficit in the Federal budget.

2. These moneys would be allocated to the States, and through them to local governments, on the basis of population, the needs of the individual States, and would be conditioned on maintenance of effort to meet their own financial requirements.

Briefly, about 80 percent of the moneys allocated each year out of the trust fund would be assigned to the States on the basis of population. On this basis, New York with 9.3 percent of the population would receive 9.3 percent of this portion of the allocation. The amount received by the State, however, would be increased or decreased, depending on the maintenance of the State's own tax effort as measured by using the ratio of the relation of State-local general revenues to personal income in the State compared to the national average ratio.

The remaining 20 percent would be distributed to the 12 or 15 States with lowest per capita incomes. Congress, of course, would maintain control over the allocation of these funds through periodic review of the formula through which they are distributed.

3. I will include in my bill the proviso that these funds be used by the States only in the fields of health, education, and welfare. There is one school of thought that believes these moneys should be distributed to the States without any restriction whatsoever. I do not agree. I feel that these moneys should be used by the States without the constant Federal supervision and red tape now endemic in the grant-in-aid programs, but that this type of program should be designed to benefit directly the greatest number of people in a State.

4. In addition, the following restrictions will be written into the bill: (a) The funds must be shared with local governments in an equitable manner. The percentage of Federal funds which the State must distribute to local governments might be defined as no less than the average of that State's distribution of its own revenues to local governments over the previous 5 years. (b) States should be required to certify that all applicable Federal laws, such as the Civil Rights acts, have been complied with in the State and local activities financed by these grants. (c) A detailed audit report on the actual uses of these funds would be required.

Certainly I do not have to tell you ladies and gentlemen about the financial difficulties facing State and local governments today. You are the people on the front line, who have to fulfill the needs of our citizens. And those needs are immediate: for better schools and educational services, for hospitals and clinics and for health and welfare services.

During the decade between 1954 and 1964 expenditures of all State and local governments doubled, while their indebtedness increased even more rapidly, from $38.9 billion to $86.4 billion or about 121 percent. In the same period, Federal budget expenditures increased 45 percent, while the public debt increased from $291 billion to $312 billion, or about 15 percent. State and local governments have been increasing their outlays much more rapidly than the Federal Government during the past few years in an attempt to meet mounting obligations. They are currently spending about $75 billion a year, a figure that may increase to about $120 billion a year by 1972.

It may be argued by some that State and local governments will not use these Federal funds wisely if they are granted or that they will reduce their own taxes and expenditures for necessary programs. Experience of the past, however, indicates that such fears are groundless, and that this will not be the case. A large proportion of total State and local outlays over the past years have been used for educational, health, and welfare purposes, an indication that local governments are cognizant of the needs of their people in these areas and are attempting to meet them.

Grants made to State and local governments under a plan such as this will enable these bodies to operate more independently.

Local officials will be free of Federal domination, and the spread of a growing Federal bureaucracy may be halted. State and local governments will be in a stronger financial position, and a better fiscal balance will be achieved between Federal, State, and local governments.

Now, let me direct one word to those on the other side of the political spectrum who may feel that the sort of tax-sharing plan I propose would mean further incursion on State prerogatives. Of course, there is always a possibility that this can happen, but the choice we face is not between State dollars and Federal dollars, but between Federal dollars bound by strings and conditions, and funds which are relatively unconditional and can help buttress the responsibility of local government.

For we have to look to the days and years ahead when the demand for more and better local governmental services will increase.

Critics on the left side of the political spectrum are suspicious of the States and seemingly convinced of Federal infallibility; critics on the right are suspicious of Washington and defend local government. But mutual suspicions should not produce a deadlock, for this country cannot be governed well unless government is imaginative and active and responsible and works at all levels in a Federal-State system.

I feel that this proposal can help prepare our governmental system to meet needs of the coming decades, and can help us to put into practice cooperative federalism for the benefit of all our people.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1965]

JAVITS BREAKS THROUGH

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS deserves a burst of applause for introducing a bill that would provide for the sharing of surplus Federal revenues with the States. The prospect for tax legislation sponsored by a member of the minority party cannot be regarded as auspicious. But Mr. JAVITS is performing the necessary task of bringing a controversial proposal to the attention of Congress for the first time.

Mr. JAVITS' point of departure has already been amply discussed by proponents of revenue sharing. The Federal Government, under conditions of high employment, will collect more tax moneys than it can wisely spend. The State and local governments will be spending more money than they can raise through efficient measures of taxation. Both problems—the embarrassing affluence of the Federal Government and the pressing needs of State and local governments—can be neatly solved through a program of Federal revenue sharing.

In the Senator's thoughtful proposal, 1 percent of the current income tax base—about $2.5 billion—would be deposited in a trust fund. The proceeds of the fund would then be allocated to the States. Each year 80 percent would be distributed on the basis of population and 20 percent would be divided among the 12 or 15 States with lowest per capita incomes.

The Federal grants would be used only to support programs in the fields of health, education and welfare. This constraint would leave the States and localities ample freedom of action, while precluding the support of programs such as highway construction that are already heavily funded by the Congress.

The revenue sharing plan was first proposed by Walter W. Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. But the President, seemingly piqued by a premature leak, has maintained an air of chilly disdain. It would be ironic indeed if this important proposal, the brainchild of a Democrat, should become the property of the opposition.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1965]

UNITED STATES-STATE TAX-SHARING PLAN REVIVED BY JAVITS

(By Frank Porter)

A leading Republican Senator plucked a controversial Federal-State revenue-sharing plan off the administration's back burner yesterday and said he will offer it as legislation before the end of the current session.

"I think it is now generally agreed that some form of Federal assistance to State and local government is necessary, but there has been a lack of serious discussion," said Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York.

"Debate should begin, and decisions should be made on a tax-sharing plan before State and local governments become completely inundated in the flood of demands for new services and facilities, particularly in the fields of health, education and welfare," JAVITS told the New York State County Officers Association in New York City.

JAVITS thereby stole a march on the White House itself, which put the plan under wraps last fall after its leaked details aroused intense opposition, particularly in labor and liberal circles.

Since then, however, it has attracted widespread grassroots interest, particularly among State and local officials feeling a financial pinch.

Republicans have made political capital of it. During last fall's presidential campaign, even Barry Goldwater embraced the concept, fathered 5 years ago by Walter W. Heller shortly before he became President Kennedy's chief economic adviser. It was a prime topic of discussion at the Republican Governors conference earlier this year.

But the administration is apparently unmoved by the JAVITS initiative. A White House source said last night that the revenue-sharing plan is a "dead duck" and that there is no present intention of reviving it.

The JAVITS bill would follow closely the Heller concept as developed last year by a presidential task force headed by Joseph A. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution. The White House has never released the Pechman report.

The carefully drawn measure also contains a number of safeguards and limitations which should go far to concilate both conservative and liberal critics.

It would create a special trust fund of 1 percent of the individual income tax base—or about $2.5 billion annually under present conditions.

Eighty percent of these funds would be allocated the States in proportion to their population. To maintain State efforts to raise their own revenue, however, these amounts would be increased or diminished by the amount the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income in the State exceeded or lagged the national ratio.

The other 20 percent would be distributed to the 12 or 15 States with the lowest per capita incomes.

The funds could be used only for health, education, and welfare to benefit directly the greatest number of people in a State. Earlier critics had opposed a no-strings type distribution on grounds the funds might be misused—say for an ornate Governors' mansion, or for highways at the expense of education.

The bill also would require an audit of how the funds are used, the equitable sharing of funds by the States with local governments, and certification that projects financed by these revenues comply with all Federal laws such as the Civil Rights Act.

THE "HAWAIIAN MONARCH"

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today in Honolulu—more than 5,000 miles from this Chamber—a versatile and unusual cargo ship, formerly a U.S. troop transport, is being rechristened by Matson Navigation Co. which has just introduced the vessel to the west coast-Hawaii trade. And soon a second vessel of the same type will follow this one into the service.

The first ship, formerly the SS *Marine Dragon*, a C–4 transport built during World War II, is being renamed the SS *Hawaiian Monarch*. Matson acquired the ship, together with the second vessel, the *Marine Devil*, from the Maritime Administration's "mothball fleet" at Suisun Bay, Calif., last year. The ships were obtained under the Ship Exchange Act which permits nonsubsidized U.S. operators to exchange certain obsolete vessels for Government reserve fleet ships. Acquisition of the big carriers and their conversion cost Matson a total of nearly $17 million.

The two ships have been converted into highly automated combination container-automobile-bulk sugar carriers. Their entry into service will have considerable impact on the State of Hawaii. But they provide only part of the story of pioneering in the Pacific by Matson Navigation Co., which was launched by Capt. William Matson 83 years ago. Matson, led today by Stanley Powell, Jr., its president, has played a leading role in development of cargo containerization in the steamship industry.

Today's rechristening of the first of the two new cargo carriers marks the latest advance by the company which has had a tradition of "firsts" in the Pacific since the days of Captain Matson. The *Hawaiian Monarch* and the *Hawaiian Queen* are unique ocean carriers, tailored to the special characteristics and requirements of the Hawaii trade. Each vessel was lengthened, or "jumboized" by addition of a 110-foot midbody section, making them 630 feet long and providing tremendous cargo capacity.

On the westbound trip, each ship will have a capacity of 650 containers and 192 automobiles. Eastbound, they can carry 12,800 tons of sugar and 537 containers, 403 of them empty, or 3,800 tons of molasses and 789 containers, 319 of them empty. The containers, incidentally, are 24 by 8 by 8½ feet.

The ships, which have a displacement of 29,300 tons, are divided into four main cargo-carrying compartments. Westbound, the No. 1 hold in the narrowing forebody is used to stow automobiles in eight levels. A combination crane-elevator can lift a car, with its motor running to a deck where it is driven off and stowed.

Three other compartments are divided into 11 cells which permit Matson's cargo containers to be stacked six high and six across below deck while additional containers can be stacked three high and eight across on deck after hatches are covered through pushbutton means. Below deck, container space is used for bulk sugar cargo on eastbound trips from Honolulu to California.

The *Hawaiian Monarch* and *Hawaiian Queen* have highly automatic central engine room control stations that house

instruments for governing steam generating equipment, propulsion turbine throttles and boiler controls.

With these two ships in its California-Hawaii fleet, Matson expects to have an annual capacity for more than 60,000 container round trips. With the *Hawaiian Monarch* and the *Hawaiian Queen*, Matson will have the capacity to meet substantially all of the container demands by Hawaii's civilian and military population of more than 700,000.

Let us look at Matson's accomplishments in recent years.

Since 1958 Matson has plowed $58 million of its own and privately financed capital into its unique Pacific Coast-Hawaii fleet containerization system.

Matson's program and the economies of its effective use helped the company to roll back its freight rates last year on almost the entire range of consumer items. This generally lowered rate structure, saving shippers several million dollars annually, is directly related to the improvements resulting from Matson's investment in its container system and fleet.

By gradually changing its fleet since 1958—from carriers of bulk cargo involving piecemeal freight handling in small lots to specialized cargo carriers such as the "jumboized" *Hawaiian Monarch* and *Hawaiian Queen*—Matson has improved its vessel utilization by nearly half. And Hawaii's rate-payers have been major beneficiaries because, had Matson not changed the configuration of its fleet for specialized services, the State's annual freight bill would be substantially higher than it is today.

I am sure that those who share my interest in American shipping will join me in congratulating Matson Navigation for its achievements in 83 years of Pacific steamship service.

FEED GRAIN SALE TO SPAIN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we were glad to read, in an announcement last week from the Department of Agriculture that the Secretary, in his capacity as Chairman of the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, had signed an agreement with Spanish co-op federation for the sale of about 600,000 metric tons of U.S. feed grains, for dollars, to be paid in 10 annual installments with interest at 4⅛ percent per year.

This is the type of sale, made under title IV of Public Law 480, in which we should be really interested. It decreases our agricultural surpluses, improves our balance of payments and helps our producers.

We commend Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture on the sale and ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Department's announcement entitled "Spanish Co-op To Buy $35 Million of U.S. Feed Grains on Credit" and the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture at the time he signed the agreement be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPANISH CO-OP TO BUY $35 MILLION OF U.S. FEED GRAINS ON CREDIT

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced the signing today of a $35 million title IV, Public Law 480 private trade agreement which will enable a Spanish federation of agricultural cooperatives to buy over a 3-year period a total of about 600,000 metric tons of U.S. feed grains.

The market development agreement was signed on behalf of the Department's Commodity Credit Corporation by Secretary Freeman, Chairman of the Board. It was signed on behalf of the co-op federation, COES (Spanish Cooperative for the Commercialization of Farm Products), by Tomas Montero Tirado, general manager.

The agreement, which provides for export financing by CCC, was negotiated under the private trade section of title IV, Public Law 480 which authorizes long-term supply and dollar credit sales contracts for U.S. agricultural commodities. The agreement calls for purchase by COES of 125,000 metric tons of U.S. feed grains in fiscal year 1966, with approximately 200,000 metric tons to be purchased in fiscal year 1967 and 275,000 metric tons in fiscal year 1968. CCC will be repaid by the co-op federation in dollars in 10 annual installments with interest at 4⅛ percent per year.

The Spanish co-op federation consists of over 900 local and provincial cooperatives who represent more than 200,000 member farm families. COES will sell the feed grains to its member cooperatives for resale to their individual farmer members.

"This is an excellent dollar sale for U.S. producers and a highly useful purchase for the Spanish co-op members who will use the feed grains both in their feeding operations and as a source of capital in improving their livestock and meat marketing operations," Secretary Freeman said.

"Under the agreement with COES we will be selling feed grains to its beef, lamb, and hog producers who have not been using any significant amount of feed grains in their operations.

"This is our largest title IV sales agreement to date. It reflects our new emphasis on private trade transactions and is our third such agreement.

"This is a fine example of how title IV is helping to build new and larger foreign markets for our farm products."

COES, in addition to the $35 million credit purchase of U.S. feed grains, has agreed to buy commercially during the next 3 years a minimum of about $18 million worth of U.S. feed grains (321,000 metric tons) plus an additional $7.4 million worth (134,000 metric tons) from free world sources, including the United States. Also it plans to buy substantial amounts of U.S. soybean meal and other feed ingredients, live cattle, and supplies and equipment needed in carrying out its livestock production and distribution program.

COES will sell the title IV feed grains, or mixed feeds made from the feed grains, to its local cooperatives on a short-term credit basis. It will use the proceeds of such sales to finance various facilities for feed grain and mixed feed processing and distribution, and facilities for livestock production and marketing. These, in turn, will earn revenue that will be used in repaying the Commodity Credit Corporation. The COES program calls for building and/or modernizing 5 feed grain port storage and handling facilities; constructing and equipping 4 feed processing plants, 7 livestock fattening centers, 10 slaughterhouses, 4 refrigerated meat distribution facilities, and 10 livestock demonstration farms; and buying a fleet of trucks and trailers for marketing feed grains, mixed livestock feeds, and meats.

Sales of U.S. feed grains under the agreement will be made by private U.S. traders. Purchase authorizations will be announced later. U.S. suppliers of title IV feed grains and equipment to be purchased from sales proceeds will be given ample opportunity to participate under public tenders to be announced by COES.

General information on the title IV, private trade agreement program is available from the Office of the General Sales Manager, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Specific information on issuance of purchase authorizations and related operational details on this agreement are available from the Program Operations Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250. Phone DUdley 8-6211 or DUdley 8-5433. (Please refer to press release USDA 2835-65.)

BACKGROUND

COES has achieved quick success as a Spanish farm marketing and service federation since its organization in 1961. Its membership has grown rapidly. Its sales volume in 1964 came to approximately $60 million. Its members are estimated to own between 10 and 15 percent of all cattle, sheep, and hogs in Spain. It is working actively with members on a program "to improve on existing practices in all phases of livestock production and distribution."

COES services a national economy which has improved rapidly in recent years. Spain's annual per capita income has increased from $85 for a population of 27 million in 1950 to a current level of about $500 for a population of over 31 million. With economic growth, demand for higher level diets—particularly meats—is strong. Although Spain's per capita consumption of red meats has risen from 37 pounds average in 1956-60 to 51 pounds in 1964, this still is among the lowest in Western Europe.

Spain is an example of a nation that is moving in the direction of full status as a major cash buyer of U.S. farm products. During the early years of Public Law 480 (food for peace) programs, special sales arrangements with Spain under title I involved more than $450 million worth of U.S. wheat, feed grains, cotton, tobacco, and fats and oils paid for in pesetas rather than dollars. Today Spain is one of the large commercial buyers of such U.S. farm products and pays in dollars. During fiscal year 1965 Spain bought, commercially, nearly $120 million worth of a wider variety of U.S. farm products.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN

It gives me great pleasure to sign this agreement. This is a trade-expanding transaction which helps both of our countries.

The agreement calls for the sale by American sellers of very substantial quantities of U.S. feed grains through the Commodity Credit Corporation to COES—the Spanish Cooperative for the Commercialization of Farm Products. Trade expansion in this agreement at a level of 600,000 metric tons of U.S. feed grains sold for $35 million—including transportation—lends new vigor to the private sector of the economy in each country.

In another sense, this agreement is a significant accomplishment. It marks the largest use to date of new trading machinery—title IV of Public Law 480, as amended in 1963—now available to American agriculture. Title IV enables us to sell our farm products on long-term dollar credit to pri-

vate citizens or organizations in eligible countries that are showing marked improvement.

Spain eminently meets this requirement. Spain's economy, in marked contrast to the situation a few years ago, is displaying new vigor, new strength, and substantial growth. Spain is moving ahead economically—and we think this agreement will add one more helpful step to that movement.

This transaction—linking the private sectors of the two countries rather than being government to government—will be of great assistance to the Spanish livestock industry. Under the agreement with COES, we will be selling our feed grains to the co-op's 200,000 farm families who produce beef, lamb, and hogs and who have not been using any significant amount of our grain in their operations. Proceeds from the sale will be used by the co-op as a source of capital to improve their livestock and meat marketing operations which in turn will earn the revenue to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation. Through this imaginative but practical agreement, the resourceful farmers of Spain will improve their production and marketing of livestock—and their incomes. Consumers of Spain will have more red meat, and better meat, in their food stores at more stable prices, if COES objectives are fully realized.

For U.S. producers this agreement will accelerate development of a permanently larger market for our farm products. COES, in addition to the $35 million credit purchase, which will be repaid in dollars in 10 annual installments, also has agreed to buy commercially during the next 3 years a minimum of about $18 million worth of U.S. feed grains, plus an additional $7.4 million worth from free world sources, including the United States. The co-op also plans to buy substantial amounts of U.S. soybean meal and other feed ingredients, live cattle, and supplies and equipment.

At a time when so many of our thoughts are concerned with the strife and discord of world affairs, the constructive private trade that we are making possible here today is in healthy and reassuring contrast.

There is an old familiar statement about "eating one's cake and having it, too." I mention this because the United States is interested in trade and it is interested in aid. This agreement is helping Spain's developing agriculture, through trade, to help itself. And that's the way Spain wants it.

By fortunate coincidence, this agreement is being signed just 3 weeks before the United States begins its observance of an annual occasion known as Cooperative Month. The month of October has been dedicated to national recognition of the important role of cooperatives in bringing a better life to people. Across our country we are reminding our citizens that through cooperative effort, and within our free enterprise system, millions of our people are voluntarily working together to bring to themselves and their families an abundance of goods and services which, without cooperation, they might never be able to obtain. It is fitting and proper that our largest single transaction under title IV should be with a foreign farmer cooperative consisting of over 900 local and provincial co-ops, representing more than 200,000 member farm families.

Again, let me say that it is a great pleasure to sign this agreement. It is a gratifying and timely example of how the people of two countries, by putting their minds to it, can match their resources and their needs in a way that is mutually helpful.

SOCIAL SECURITY BONUS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, evidence that the recently passed increase in social security benefits is having a marked effect across the Nation is already beginning to develop. In voting a 7-percent across-the-aboard increase in social security benefits, Congress approved a retroactive payment to January 1, 1965. Lump sum checks covering that time period are now being mailed to social security beneficiaries all over America. It is clear that for many oldsters, Christmas is taking place in September. To these retirees living on few dollars, the retroactive payment check is truly a bonus which helps them buy clothes, pay overdue bills or perhaps pay for a dinner in a restaurant. These payments not only help the senior citizen, they help the community in which he lives.

An example of the impact of these retroactive payments in one community is well-reported in the September 22 edition of the Wall Street Journal, which sent Kenneth G. Slocum to St. Petersburg, Fla., a well-known retirement city, to find out how the money was being spent. Mr. Slocum did a thorough job and I ask unanimous consent that his report in the September 22 Wall Street Journal be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGED QUICKLY SPEND SOCIAL SECURITY BONUS TO MAKE LIFE EASIER—CHECKS FOR RETROACTIVE BOOST GO FOR CLOTHES, FOOD, RENT; BONANZA IN ST. PETERSBURG

(By Kenneth G. Slocum)

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—William Wilkins, a retired bricklayer, has already spent his social security "bonus." "Nineteen dollars for a car repair job, $10 for some overdue bills and a few dollars at the drugstore."

Gifford Adams, a former bookkeeper, will use his check "to put some new rags on the old frame."

And a frail old couple here will use the money to change hotel rooms. "Instead of a $10-a-week room with cockroaches on First Street we're getting a clean $13-a-week room on Sixth Street, where we also hope to meet a better class of people."

The money that is paying bills and changing plans in this retirement city is the 7 percent increase in social security payments, retroactive to January 1. The initial batch of checks covering the back payments began pouring in here—and across the Nation—Saturday morning, and by Saturday afternoon cash registers were zinging and the thousands of oldsters who daily sit on the tree-shaded benches lining St. Petersburg avenues were abuzz with talk of their new plans.

SURE LOOKS MIGHTY GOOD

"That extra $5.90 a month wouldn't mean a thing to a guy making $10,000 a year. But, boy, when you're 70 and everything is going out and nothing is coming in that extra sure looks mighty good," says Lonnie Hutchins, a former New York truckdriver.

The money is already providing a spur to the economy of this typical city, where 28 percent of the 215,000 residents are 65 or older. "Our sales Saturday were the best in a long time," says the manager of a Food Fair supermarket. At Webb's City, a complex of stores catering to the elderly, Saturday sales of toothpaste, patent medicines, and sundry items were $5,000 above normal.

The impact of the extra social security disbursement can be seen most quickly here, where life is geared to the needs of the elderly, where sidewalks slope to street levels at each corner and where drug and dime stores advertise blood-pressure readings for 50 cents. But the impact isn't limited to this sunny city. Nationwide, about 9 percent of the population is 65 or older, and the retroactivity checks are supplying these people immediately with a hefty $885 million in additional buying power.

Talks with scores of old folks here and studies by authorities on the problems of the aged indicate the recipients will spend the money as fast as they get it. Indeed, only 1 in 10 of the people interviewed expressed any thought of saving the money. "Most of it is already spent, but, shucks, isn't that what it's for?" says one retired man here. Adds George Malis, a retired steelworker: "At 72, there's no use saving money."

FOR THE ECONOMY, $1.2 BILLION

In addition to the back payments, the regular monthly social security checks for the 20.5 million recipients, mostly oldsters, will be fatter beginning with the September payment, to be mailed out early next month. This rise, plus the retroactivity payments, will channel an estimated $1.2 billion into the economy in the next 4 months, and another $100 million a month thereafter. The money is being counted on by Johnson administration experts to provide a major stimulus to the already booming economy.

The retroactive payments covering the months from January through August will average about $48 for single retired workers, $80 for aged couples, $40 for aged widows, $112 for a widow with two children, $56 for disabled workers and $104 or more for a disabled worker with a wife and at least one child. The monthly increase for a retired worker ranges from $4 to $8.90; a widow's monthly increase ranges from $3.30 to $7.40.

For many persons, the money will provide some basic necessities which they have been going without. Consider, for instance, the straits of Anthony Souza, 79, a retired carpenter from Rhode Island who lives entirely on his social security payment. The check was $100 before the increase.

"My hotel room costs me $40 a month, and, if I watch it, I can eat in cafeterias for $2 a day," he explains. "So I can scrape by—except in those months with 31 days." The increase, which will lift Mr. Souza's check to $107 a month, "will make life a little easier," he says.

A silvery haired widow of 70, sitting on the front porch of the old Detroit Hotel, is asked what she will do with her retroactivity check and pension increase. Reaching over to feel the quality of a visitor's suit coat, she asks: "Sonny, when was the last time you chewed gum for breakfast?"

On Saturday, the prescription drug department at Webb's City reported business was 15 percent above normal, "indicating that some of these people had been unable to pay for prescriptions until the retroactive checks arrived," says James Webb, executive vice president. The store also posted "very substantial" gains in the eyeglass and hearing aid departments, he says.

Most of the money seems to be going for food, clothing, and other ordinary, everyday expenses, however. "I've cashed so many blue Government checks today I'm blue in the face," says Willie Houchins, an executive at a huge Grandway Department Store here. "Most of them seem to be spending it for household items such as pots and pans, and clothes—a housedress for her and a pair of slacks for him," he adds.

Holding up two fistfuls of Government checks, the manager of the Food Fair says: "This is all I've been doing. I've cashed over 500 retroactive checks in 2 days. It's apparent that a good part of the retroactive checks is going for food."

At Webb's City Saturday, gains of 17 percent were posted in the ladies' ready-to-wear department, 11 percent in men's wear, and 1 percent in household furnishings, in comparison with normal Saturday business. By contrast, the jewelry and landscaping-nursery departments had no gains.

Some of the money, however, will go for increased prices, at least in this west Florida area. "Six months ago I paid 10 cents in a local cafeteria for a dish of grated carrots. Now I pay 18 cents," complains Clarence Wahlers, a retired toolmaker of 79. "A year ago I could get a decent meal for $1; today it costs me $1.25."

Eggs in the favorite restaurant of William Luth, a 73-year-old former construction laborer, now are 14 cents, up from 12 cents a week ago, he says. And Mr. and Mrs. Fred Weber complain that the "budget bacon" that cost them 35 cents a pound a few months ago now costs 70 cents.

The owner of a grocery store confirms that prices have been inching up the past few months because of higher costs to us. A restaurant owner says he has raised prices because of an expected minimum-wage law governing the restaurant business.

Not all the elderly, of course, are living such a hand-to-mouth existence. For the nonimpoverished, the new social security money will just mean a windfall, to be frittered away in one manner or another. "It's nice, sure," says William Wright, a 71-year-old with a scampish grin. "But I didn't need it. I have a nice pension from Bethlehem Steel and a few bucks tucked away." Mr. Wright feels he is so sound financially that he recently married, even though his 42-year-old bride isn't old enough for social security.

But for others, it will, as Mr. Souza says, make life a little easier. For Manly Corbin, 68, the money will mean "my first new suit in years." For John Morrow, 71, a $40 retroactive check will help buy an old car.

For still others, however, the money won't be enough, especially to cover medical expenses. These people, though, look to medicare to help solve their problems and generally figure their ailments can wait to be treated next July, when the Government program of medical care for the elderly takes effect.

"I have a tumor on my back but I figure both it and I can last until next year when medicare goes into effect," says John Doran, a gravel-voiced man of 70 who used to buy food for a Buffalo, N.Y., restaurant chain. "I just can't spare the dough so Uncle Sam is going to pay for most of the operation."

Harvey Jackson, 79, concurs. "Several of my friends are putting off kidney and bladder operations until medicare goes into effect," he says. "Some don't have the money and others don't want to spend what they have."

ATLANTA CONSTITUTION NARRATES HOW EXPERIENCE POINTS TO NEED FOR NEW GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the unparalleled success of the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict provided the necessary financial impetus to enable some 10 million veterans to enroll for education and training at a cost to this Government which has been more than repaid. Indeed, information supplied by the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce indicates that incomes of veterans who received GI bill assistance in education averaged from $1,000 to $1,500 a year more than the incomes of those who failed to take advantage of this educational aid. If we do not grant our approval to a new GI bill this session this Congress will be rejecting one of the greatest opportunities to provide for the future intellectual and economic strength of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by the widely read Mr. George Boswell, which appeared in the September 17, 1965, issue of the influential and prestigious Atlanta, Ga. Constitution be printed at this point in the RECORD. The article is entitled "GI Bill Helped Build a Stronger Nation."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI BILL HELPED BUILD A STRONGER NATION

(By George Boswell)

The proposed cold war GI bill is a reminder of the remarkable results of the original GI bill of World War II. The bill was unprecedented. It was motivated largely by fears of what might happen to the country and its economy by the rapid dismantling of our military force, which at its peak numbered about 16 million men and women. This was accompanied, of course, by the reconversion of our gigantic industrial complex from a war basis to peace.

Whether or not it was justified, there was great worry about how these veterans—with average time in service of 2½ years—would readjust to civilian life. It was recalled that Mussolini and Hitler had risen to power with the support of disgruntled veterans. American veterans did not react that way, of course, but turned themselves into a mighty force to create a greater America. How much was due to the GI bill is impossible to measure but by any yardstick its cost was negligible compared to the benefits which have accrued to the Nation because of it.

No other country had ever attempted to aid veterans in readjustment on such a scale. Millions were put on the road to becoming self-reliant citizens and leaders of the Nation and their communities. Under its educational program, almost 8 million took advantage of opportunities to improve skills or to learn new ones.

More than 6.7 million home loans and 300,000 other loans with a face value of $65 billion were made under guaranteed VA loans under the World War II and Korean GI bills. About 3 million of these already have been paid in full. Less than 3 percent have been terminated with claims.

To aid in the adjustments, the original GI bill allowed payments to veterans of $20 per week for 52 weeks. This so-called "52–20" club was the most controversial feature of all, its critics claiming it would result in millions of loafers. They did not understand the returning GI. Among all veterans, an average of only 19 weeks of the allowance was used. Most were too busy finding better jobs, improving their future opportunities through education and training, creating new businesses and entering expanding trade fields.

Perhaps the greatest achievement was in the educational field. As a group, veterans who entered the Nation's schools and colleges proved themselves to be the best students in their respective institutions. They did not waste their opportunities and as a result the Nation was enriched by millions of college-trained leaders in business, science, skilled trades, and the professions with earnings that exceed those of nonveterans of the same age group.

The performance of these veterans confounded the critics who called the GI bill a senseless handout and socialism. They responded to the aid with individual zeal to become more independent and productive citizens in an economy that had to grow. The feared class of dependent veterans did not materialize.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD five editorials which appeared in West Virginia newspapers in support of my opposition to the immigration bill. I have now received a sixth editorial, this one having appeared in the Weirton, W. Va., Daily Times on Tuesday, September 21.

I call attention to the following paragraphs taken from the editorial:

Certainly it is difficult to understand why we would want to encourage massive migration to the United States at the very time when our Nation is confronted with critical problems of unemployment, poverty, depressed areas, automation, integration, increasing crime, and a skyrocketing welfare bill.

The advocates of the change state that under the proposed legislation it will be easier for people "of special skills" to come into the country and help the U.S. economy. Yet, under the new legislation there would be an increase in quotas for such countries as Trinidad, Jamaica, Tanzia, Malawi, Yemen, and Nepal, and it would seem that persons with special skills needed in the United States might be very hard to find in those countries. Besides, these countries need the services of their talented and trained people more than we do if they hope to build a better economy.

The United States need make no apologies for its immigration policies which already are far more liberal than other countries and in view of the fact that other advanced nations are selective in dealing with immigrants * * *.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the entire editorial from the Weirton Daily Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLD THE LINE

U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD has taken a very reasonable and sound stand in opposing the administration's proposed new immigration bill which would scrap the basic national origins quota system first drawn in 1924.

Admittedly there are some weaknesses in the present system as it applies no limitations on immigration from South America and other Western Hemispheric countries, yet it has served the interests of the United States well in the past. The proposed legislation now being considered, however, would pose grave problems for our country and in a way could lessen the effectiveness of current U.S. policy to help other countries improve their economic conditions.

Certainly it is difficult to understand why we would want to encourage massive migration to the United States at the very time when our Nation is confronted with critical problems of unemployment, poverty, depressed areas, automation, integration, increasing crime and a skyrocketing welfare bill.

In many parts of the country, including our own, joblessness remains a nagging problem. As stated by Senator BYRD, sooner or later we are going to have to recognize the realities of this situation and admit to ourselves that our first responsibility in matters of immigration is to the people of the United States and not to the entire population of the world.

The advocates of the change state that under the proposed legislation it will be easier for people of special skills to come into the country and help the U.S. economy. Yet, under the new legislation, there would be an increase in quotas for such countries as Trinidad, Jamaica, Tanzia, Malawi, Yemen, and Nepal, and it would seem that persons with special skills needed in the United States might be very hard to find in those countries. Besides, these countries need the services of their talented and trained people more than we do if they hope to build a better economy.

Under the present system, it is true that relatively larger quotas are assigned to such countries as England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, France, and Scandinavia, but this is because the basic population of our country is made up largely of stocks which originated from those countries, and the reasoning back of the present system is that additional population from those countries would be more easily and readily assimilated into the American population. As pointed out by the West Virginia Senator there are fine human beings in all parts of the world, but peoples do differ widely in their social habits, their levels of ambition, their mechanical aptitudes, their inherited ability and intelligence, their moral traditions, and their capacities for maintaining stable governments.

The United States need make no apologies for its immigration policies which already are far more liberal than other countries and in view of the fact that other advanced nations are selective in dealing with immigrants.

The time is here when we must begin thinking about our own national interest without being influenced by foreign nationals. We fully support the stand of Senator BYRD on this vital issue.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 29, line 4, change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "*Provided*, That for all fiscal years after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, said 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants, exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A), and immediate relatives admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my amendment would not affect the application of the bill to the increased immigration prior to June 30, 1968. It is my understanding that there is a backlog of immigrant applications which should be taken care of. I understand from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator in charge of the bill, that it is anticipated that after 3 years the backlogs of impending immigrants will be eliminated in all instances except for one category of Italians, and that the situation will be rectified shortly thereafter. So during the next 3 years, the backlog of immigrants can be substantially cleaned up.

I believe we ought to focus our attention on what will happen after that. What will happen on July 1, 1968? My amendment is concerned with what will happen after that date.

I am aware of how complicated the whole subject of immigration is. Much confusion exists with respect to it. There are quota immigrants, there are nonquota immigrants, and there are specially exempt categories. If one tries to concern himself with these groups, he may end by seeing only the trees, and not seeing the forest. I believe we ought to be concerned with the forest; namely, the total number of immigrants, regardless of their quality, whether they are called quota, nonquota, or exempt categories. The question should be, How many immigrants are coming into the United States, and how many will be coming into the United States?

The national origins policy which has existed for many years leaves much to be desired. Probably the principal thrust of the bill is to do away with the national origins policy and to treat all people alike, regardless of the country from which they come, so long as they can satisfy the category requirements provided in the bill. My amendment has nothing to do with that. It has only to do with the total number of immigrants that will be coming into the United States starting on July 1, 1968.

The record shows that in 1960, the total number of immigrants into the United States was 265,000; in 1961, 271,000; in 1962, 283,000; in 1963, 306,000; and in 1964, 292,000. To all intents and purposes, it appears that the bill provides for 290,000 immigrants, 170,000 from the world at large and 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere.

But the bill goes further: It provides for certain exempt categories in addition to the 290,000. According to the record it is estimated that over and above the 290,000, we can expect 50,000, 60,000, or 70,000 more immigrants a year. No one knows with certainty what the number in the exempt categories will amount to. But as I recall, the Attorney General estimated that 62,500 more immigrants a year would come in starting on July 1, 1968, than are coming in now.

With respect to the confusion to which I referred earlier, considerable point has been made concerning the present annual quotas which some countries have and how low they are. For example, Greece has been mentioned as having an annual quota for 1964 of only 849. However, the record should show, so that the people will know exactly what is taking place, that while 849 quota immigrants were authorized for Greece in 1964, there were 3,060 nonquota immigrants admitted from Greece. This immigration was entirely legal but was in addition to the regular quota.

There are other examples. Last year, Italy was authorized 5,950 immigrants; yet 7,295 nonquota immigrants were admitted over and above the quota immigrants. So perhaps the way the present program has been working, so far as certain countries are concerned, there may not be so much hardship as the plain quota figures would indicate. The total number of persons who have been legally admitted is what really counts.

To return to my amendment, it seems to me that if the policy of Congress is to do away with the national origins system and at the same time preserve the total number of immigrants at about the same rate at which they have been admitted during the last few years, the target ought to be somewhere around 290,000 to 300,000. Assuming that the target is 290,000, I have left the figures of 170,000 and 120,000 undisturbed; but my amendment provides that the 170,000 quota immigrants for the world at large shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants who are exempted under the bill; and that after the 170,000 is reduced by the number of special immigrants who are admitted into the United States, the remainder would be quota immigrants.

My amendment is not intended to reduce the 120,000 total number of immigrants. The intention is to retain the 170,000 figure and to start by taking the exempt categories off the top. Then, after they have been admitted, we shall know how many quota immigrants can be taken in.

If the exempt categories amounted to 10,000 immigrants in 1 year, we would have 160,000 quota immigrants. If the exempt categories amounted to 20,000, we would have 150,000 quota immigrants.

There is no intention of reducing the number of immigrants in any one year below 290,000—170,000 from the world at large and 120,000 from Latin America.

On the other hand, if it is the intention of the administration and the policy of Congress not only to do away with the national origins system, but also to increase the total number of immigrants coming into the United States by 50,000, 60,000, or 70,000 a year, starting on July 1, 1968, then my amendment should be rejected and the bill should be passed in its present form.

Mr. President, I see no reason for any further explanation of my amendment. It is very simple. I believe that the issue is clear.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to review with the Senator from Iowa the intention of his amendment. I believe I understand from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa what he is attempting to do in general, but I am not sure that the language of his amendment is fully clear on its face. The amendment reads in part:

Provided, That for all fiscal years after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, said 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants—

Special immigrants have been defined under the bill to apply to those coming from the Western Hemisphere, which number has been set at 120,000; I read further from the amendment—

exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A), and immediate relatives admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year—

It seems to me, if I read the amendment correctly, that it would provide that, for all fiscal years after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the figure of 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants—which, as defined by this bill, would mean those from the Western Hemisphere, as well as immediate relatives admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year.

So as I read the amendment, what the Senator is attempting to do is to reduce the figure of 170,000 by the number of special immigrants. It would also include those defined in the McCarran-Walter Act as having a particular immediate family relationship, who would be admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year.

I wish to ascertain whether I read that language correctly before I address my comments to the relative merits of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. I do so because I have not seen this amendment before and received it but a few brief minutes ago.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe that we ought to be in agreement on the language before we enter into a discussion of the merits.

I would be the last one in the world to suggest, in dealing with a complex subject such as this, that this amendment is letter perfect. I believe that it is accurate. The language which states that the 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants does not relate to Western Hemisphere people at all. The term "special immigrants" refers to the special category born in the Western Hemisphere, children, spouses, and parents of immigrants previously admitted to the United States for permanent residence, but who have temporarily been abroad, former U.S. citizens who are now eligible to reapply for citizenship, ministers, and their spouses and children, employees, and retired former employees of the U.S. Government.

Some people who have been born in the Western Hemisphere are residents of the United States and of other countries in the world at large outside the Western Hemisphere. However, this is the group which is referred to and covered by the phrase "special immigrants."

I have in my amendment specifically excluded special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A). These are the people from the Western Hemisphere, concerning which the 120,000 limitation is placed in the bill.

I suggest to the Senator that my amendment would provide that the 170,000 shall be reduced only by the special categories to which I have referred, and that it would not include the 120,000 Western Hemisphere people referred to or covered by section 101(a)(27)(A).

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I refer to the committee report and the description contained in the report concerning section 8 of the bill. It reads as follows:

Section 8 of the bill amends section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 101(a)(27) of that act, which defines "nonquota immigrant," is amended to eliminate the term "nonquota immigrant," and insert in lieu thereof "special immigrant." Therefore, natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, returning resident aliens, certain former citizens of the United States, ministers of religion, and certain retired employees of the U.S. Government abroad previously referred to as "nonquota immigrants," will henceforth be referred to as "special immigrants."

Before we get into the question of the merits of this amendment, I wish to be absolutely sure of what we are talking about. Are we sure that under this amendment we would not take the figure of 170,000 and reduce it by the number of special immigrants, which for the general purpose of discussion includes Western Hemisphere and certain others under section 101? Are we sure that we would not be taking the 170,000 and reducing it by 120,000, because that number of Western Hemisphere immigrants would fall within the definition of special immigrants as defined by the legislation?

If that is not correct, I believe that the amendment would be a bit unrealistic at this point. If I correctly understand what the Senator is trying to do—and perhaps we could have a discussion of it—it is the intent of the Senator to provide that those who have a special family relationship may be included within the 170,000—sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, and parents of American citizens.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe that is the fundamental point of the Senator from Iowa. I should like to comment briefly on that point.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I must insist that the language contained in the amendment which says "excusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)27(A)" refers to the 120,000 Western Hemisphere people.

If the Senator will look at section 101(a)27(A), I am sure that he will find that this is the section that covers the Western Hemisphere people on which the 120,000 limitation is placed in the bill. I fully intend to say, and I believe the amendment does say, that we will not take those people into account at all. They would be excluded from the coverage of my amendment.

We are not meddling with the Western Hemisphere 120,000 figure at all. All I want to do is to subtract or deduct from the 170,000 those special categories to which the Senator has just referred.

I invite the attention of the Senator to page 28 of the committee report. Down near the bottom of the page, there appears section 101(a)(27) which defines special immigrants. However, section 101(a)27(A) would be specifically excluded under my amendment. So the other categories are included. Those would be the family-type relationships to which the Senator has been referring.

If there is any difficulty over the legislative drafting of this amendment, I am sure that we can get together on it. However, I should like to have a little discussion with the Senator about the objectives of my amendment. I assume that we can get together on the legislative drafting.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has raised a point which is basic and fundamental to the legislation the Senate is considering this afternoon whether we will have a figure of 170,000 numbers for the world, and whether it will be 120,000 numbers for the Western Hemisphere, all exclusive of immediate relatives as deferred in the bill. These are figures arrived at in a way that should be reviewed, and I shall review it very briefly.

At the time of legislative consideration prior to the passage of the 1924 Immigration Act, the figure of 150,000 was established. It was based on an annual total number of immigrants equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of the population of the United States in 1920. Quotas were then assigned on the basis of the nationality of the U.S. white population at that time.

The figure of 150,000 was gradually raised as new independent countries were recognized by the United States, until it reached 158,561, which is the figure today. The figure of 170,000 represents these 158,561 numbers plus the inclusion of 10,200 numbers set aside for refugees, which would make a total of 168,761. That figure was rounded off at 170,000. For the Western Hemisphere countries, the figure of 120,000, exclusive of immediate relatives, was reached on the basis of experience during the past 5 to 10 years.

Thus, Mr. President, we arrive at the figures that we are talking about, 170,000 for countries throughout the world exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, and 120,000 for countries in the Western Hemisphere.

The Senator from Iowa raises the question, Should not the immediate family relationships be included in the 170,000?

Mr. President, that would attack the very basis of the pending legislation, aside from the elimination of the national origins system and the Asian-Pacific triangle.

The McCarran-Walter Act, under its preference system, assigns 50 percent of all quota members to skilled aliens who have particular skills which are urgently needed in the economy of the United States.

That entire preference concept has been changed in the pending legislation to one emphasizing the reunification of families. The preferences in this bill have thus been changed to provide that preferential consideration shall be given to family reunification. The first preference is for those who would come to the United States as unmarried sons and daughters of American citizens, the second preference is for family relatives of aliens, the third, and only the third preference—and this is only 10 percent—to those who have skills at the professional level. The fourth preference is given to married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens. The fifth preference is given to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; the sixth preference is given to labor needed here because of a short supply in certain types of labor, the seventh to the refugees; and the eighth is left for what are called new seed immigrants.

In this legislation, therefore, those who have particular skills are reduced to third and sixth preferences. The bill recognizes the basic human concern which Americans have for the reunification of families. We know, even looking at today's situation under the McCarran-Walter Act, referring to figures from the Department of State, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, that there are numbers of instances of family separation caused by our immigration laws. For instance, in the Asia Pacific triangle, under the second preference of the McCarran-Walter Act, covering parents of U.S. citizens 21 years of age or over and unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, there are 52 parents of American citizens who would like to come to the United States; there are 1,300 people of Chinese extraction; there are 876 Greek family separation cases; 29 from India, 39 from Iran, 25 from Iraq, 231 from Panama, 151 from Japan, 49 from Korea, 615 from the Philippines, 166 from Portugal, 318 from Turkey, and so on.

These are typical examples. It was because of these examples that such serious consideration was given by the subcommittees in both the House of Representatives and the Senate to the importance of the reunification of families.

I recognize, as the Senator from Iowa has stated, that with the exception of some special family relationships—such as those of certain categories of Italians, we would in the next 3 years reunify the families now awaiting reunification. Nonetheless, under this amendment, the problem would arise repeatedly in the future. It is well to consider the basic concept and philosophy of this legislation. It would be regressive to change the special consideration for which the bill provides, and I would hope that the Senator from Iowa would reconsider his proposal.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say to my friend the Senator from Massachusetts that I agree with him in all he has said about reunification of families. However, I invite his attention to the fact that the figures he has quoted are figures which have arisen under the backlog created under the present law, which should be taken care of in the next 3 years. I cannot believe that 3 years from now he will be able to show any such figures as he has given us, because the intention of the bill is that these cases be taken care of in the next 3 years. My amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with that period of time so far as the bill is concerned.

I suggest further that another reason why the figures the Senator from Massachusetts has given us exist is the unfortunate national origins policy under which this country has been operating. The pending bill would abolish that; and there again, I cannot imagine that 3 years from now there will be any figures of such magnitude available, because the national origins system will be out, and we shall have much more flexibility in handling family reunification problems.

Are we going to make a decision on the total number of people per year that will be coming into the United States starting July 1, 1968? If we are going to make a decision on that total, what is the total to be?

My amendment would leave the total at 290,000, which is almost exactly what the figure was last year, 170,000 for the world at large and the 120,000 for the Western Hemisphere.

The way the bill is now written, it would not be 290,000, but, rather, 290,000, plus whatever number would come in under the exempt categories. We are told this figure could be 40,000, 50,000, 60,000 or 70,000 a year. The Attorney General has testified that his estimate was 62,500 a year. However, no one knows.

We do know, however, that it would be more than we are taking in now.

I believe it would be better, if the Senator from Massachusetts believes that 290,000 is too low, to make the figure 180,000, instead of 170,000; and we could make the Western Hemisphere figure 120,000 or 130,000. Then we would have 310,000 immigrants a year, and we would know what the ceiling would be. We could then adapt my amendment to that situation, by providing that the various exempt categories should come off the top, and the other categories should be divided. We are not talking about a hardship situation. The bill is designed to deal with the hardship situation.

What is involved is a policy decision that should be faced. The American people should know exactly what is being done. I know of no one who is not in favor of doing away with the national origin system. I believe all Senators are in agreement on that point.

The question is what we should do about numbers. Let us not get down to quotas, and so forth. Let us know where we are going.

Under the bill we shall have perhaps 365,000 a year. It is roughly 290,000 a year now. Perhaps that is what we should do. I am not necessarily saying that we should not do it, but I believe it would be a good idea to get at the figures that we have now and clean up the figures in the next 3 years, and say that they ought to be cleaned up. Then we could start on July 1, 1968, knowing exactly where we are going.

At that time, if it is decided to be in the national interest to increase our immigrant total over 300,000 and make it 365,000, that is the time for Congress to make that decision. I believe that it is a little premature at this time, particularly in the case of such an important piece of legislation, to make that anticipation. It seems to me that what we should do is to stay with the figure of approximately 290,000, so that everyone will know that the 290,000 immigrants will be admitted into the United States, starting July 1, 1968; and that is exactly what my amendment would do.

I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he is satisfied with the language of my amendment. I would feel unhappy about having the amendment go off on the basis of a dispute over the drafting of the amendment. I believe that it really should go off on the basis of a decision as to whether we are to have a ceiling on the total number we are admitting now.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The amendment offered by the Senator may still be open to interpretation, but that thought aside, we could certainly work out language to include what the Senator from Iowa is attempting to do. It is open to different interpretations, but it would be fair to say that it could include what the Senator from Iowa has mentioned.

I go back to the fact that through the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, we have been able to determine that we can expect over time, given the present legislation which is now being considered by the Senate, between 50,000 and 60,000 people who will come in and take advantage of our new immigration laws. This is based upon similar conditions in the past, the knowledge of present demands, and anticipation for future demands.

I do not believe that there is any Senator who does not recognize that this bill establishes a worldwide quota, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere.

There is also a number that will be given to the Western Hemisphere, and that has to be exclusive of those which have close family relationships. Families are excluded by the announced policy of those who have supported the proposed legislation that they should be given special consideration.

We recognize that there will be between 50,000 and 60,000 people—the best

figures we have been able to acquire—who will come in. Thus, I would feel that if the Senator from Iowa has an amendment to restrict the total number—as I would gather from the colloquy this afternoon by establishing a worldwide quota—I believe that this would be something for Senators to study. I feel, however, that this question has been debated, both by the proponents and the opponents of the bill. It has also been specifically determined, and defended in committee that those who have a particular family relationship will not be considered the same as other immigrants.

This is the whole concept of the bill. The reunification of families is provided for by the new preference system and the immediate relative category.

Thus, I submit, as worthy as the amendment may appear to the Senator, and notwithstanding the great respect I have for the Senator from Iowa, I believe that his amendment would attack the fundamental concept of the bill—that is, to guarantee the unification of families. If the Senate is interested in putting a fixed worldwide quota in our laws, that is one thing, but I believe this amendment would do a great disservice to the concept embodied in the proposed legislation. I believe that that concept is good and should continue. I would certainly be opposed to any alteration of that very basic and fundamental principle in the proposed legislation.

Mr. MILLER. I am not particularly interested in disrupting family relationships. That is not the intention behind my amendment. I take it that is the basic difficulty the Senator from Massachusetts finds with the amendment.

As I understand, the bill would establish a list of seven preference priorities: Unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; husbands and wives, unmarried sons or daughters of alien residents; members of professions; married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; skilled and unskilled persons capable of filling labor shortages; and refugees from communism.

I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Massachusetts: Assuming that we have the 170,000 world-at-large figure, and there are 170,000 people in the categories which are set forth as preferences in the bill; would he anticipate that those who did not meet the preference categories would come in under nonpreference?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is the final preference category.

Mr. MILLER. All right.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There are provisions for visa numbers to spill down from preference category to preference category. Those that run out of the first preference go to the second. Those that run off the second go to the fourth. They do not go to the third, which deals with the professionals. In the final analysis, all unused numbers go to what is called the new seed preference.

Mr. MILLER. If what the Senator is concerned about is the family group and some of the professions, for example, I wonder whether we could not get into the bill the purpose of my amendment, by providing that the reduction shall come only from the nonpreference categories, so that if we had 170,000 for the world at large, and we would subtract from that the number that would come in under the exempt category 20,000, if 150,000 were embraced in the seven preference priorities, in that way we would have a total of 170,000 which would include the exempt categories and the preference categories—the family relationship people, and the skilled and unskilled people, but there would not be any preference people admitted in that situation.

Would the Senator have any objection to an amendment which would provide that the categories in the preference section, which he is obviously concerned about—and which I am also concerned about—are protected, so that the only result of my amendment in a given situation would result in a reduction of the nonpreference categories.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Is the Senator now referring to the last preference category?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator would reduce the new seed category. May I ask to what extent?

Mr. MILLER. To the extent that the exempt categories total——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. How does the Senator know the situation in any given country?

The Senator realizes, does he not, that there is a restriction on each country?

Mr. MILLER. I know that there is a restriction. It is a fairly liberal restriction.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Does the Senator believe that it could possibly apply to Italy, with the great emphasis on family relationships, with the given restrictions which are even in this bill. It is unrealistic.

Mr. MILLER. It would not apply at all, because in my suggestion, all the family relationships I am talking about would be left unimpeded under the 170,000 figure. I would provide that with respect to categories, that particular total would be reduced, if necessary, by the total number of the exempt categories who are admitted over and above the 170,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we have been having hearings since February of this year, in which each of these preference categories was considered in great detail. We worked them out on the basis of experience, needs, and demands. The Senate committee considered them. The House committee considered them. I think what we eventually come down to in this dialog with the Senator from Iowa is whether we ought to be establishing a worldwide quota.

This question is basic to the subject. We have had months of hearings on this particular subject. Members of the committee considered it in detail. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa takes us back to a fundamental decision, and that is the particular relationship of the available numbers to the world and the Western Hemisphere, as well as the considerations that we will give to the close family relationships.

Now the Senator from Iowa comes in at the final hour with a proposal to alter the basic structure of the bill. I do not believe the amendment should be favorably considered. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have a question to ask the Senator in charge of the bill. Is it correct that in considering this legislation the committee did look into the figure of 170,000 and the figure of 120,000 with respect to Latin America, and the question of special immigrants? Is it not correct that those matters were considered in great detail?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. Not only that, but in considering the allocation under section 203, we considered the question whether those to be admitted were to be unmarried sons or daughters of American citizens, or unmarried sons or daughters of alien residents. We considered how it would affect immigrants with special skills, and how and whether they should benefit from spillovers from subsections (1) and (2). We considered the question of what percent should be given to refugees and so forth.

The whole question has been given a great deal of concern and consideration by the voluntary agencies which have been concerned with these matters. Members of Congress who are concerned as a result of the constant examples being brought to the attention of their offices in this field have considered it. After reviewing all those factors, we worked this matter out. In the final hour, to alter the bill or to give different priorities would not be the course of wisdom.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Therefore, as the committee considered the bill, instead of arriving at the figure of 170,000, it could have arrived at the figure of 120,000. However, it was decided by the committee to arrive at the figure of 170,000, but that the other would be left flexible. Was that factor considered?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It was considered. There was considerable discussion as to whether there should be a worldwide quota. We did not think it would be worthwhile.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it anticipated that any immigrant who comes in under that category will be a charge to the United States?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. No. As the Senator from New York knows, because he testified on this matter, that the labor provisions have been strengthened. The public health charge provisions are still in existence. The other broad provisions which deal with security, health, and all the rest, have been carried through from the old McCarran Act. They are worthwhile, and were retained, and in some instances strengthened.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Was there a feeling in the committee that the United States, with a working population of some 70 million, could not afford to bring in this group of immigrants who have special skills or special relationships here in the United States? Was that question gone into by the committee?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It was. As the Senator from New York knows, the total number who will be admitted into this country under the bill will be a lesser percentage in relation to our population in 1965 than the number of people who came into this country in 1924, when this very restrictive legislation was adopted. So, for many reasons, some of which I have gone into, the committee reached a certain figure. I believe it would be unfortunate to tamper with it at this late hour.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What the amendment of the Senator from Iowa actually amounts to, in substance, is the reduction of the number of persons who may come into this country by 40,000 or 50,000 or 60,000. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. This question was considered. It was gone into in great detail, based on what we have done in the past, and what we can do in the future. There are restrictions imposed as to the people who will come into this country, so that they will not become public charges but can contribute to and aid our economy, or who have close relatives in this country. The entire question was gone into by the committee. I do not think it appropriate now to say that we should cut that quota by 25,000 or 30,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has touched on the fundamental point of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa—the idea that between 40,000 and 50,000 shall be cut out of the total number of people who could come into this country. That is what the amendment of the Senator from Iowa attempts to accomplish. As the Senator from New York mentioned, the figures which are set forth in the bill have been carefully considered. I believe they are basically meritorious and that they should be supported.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Three points should be made. First, with respect to the question of the Senator from New York, as to whether this amendment would cut anything, it ought to be made very clear that it is not going to cut anything from what we are doing. My amendment would leave in all 290,000. We admitted 292,000 last year. We admitted fewer before that. I have given the 5-year average. The average for the past 5 years is well under 290,000. I do not see how anyone can say that my amendment would cut anything. If the Senator tells me that we are going to admit 65,000 people a year more than we are admitting now, my amendment is calculated to prevent that, but it is not going to cut anything over and above what we are doing now.

That is the first point.

The second point——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point, before he goes to another point?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That point has been understood. It was brought out by me, when I introduced the bill. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has strong feelings on the matter. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has opposed it in the past 4 or 5 days of debate during which the bill has been before the Senate—namely, that we are going to have an increase of 40,000 or 50,000 immigrants under this bill. That is recognized, and if there is any Member of the Senate who is under the impression that that has not been brought out, I would like to clear the air on that point right now. If the Senator from Iowa says he wants to include immediate relatives under the other categories, his amendment would in effect cut down the total number of people who will be affected by H.R. 2580.

Mr. MILLER. And will come in under the bill starting in 1968.

I wish to make it clear that my amendment is not designed to cut down any numbers we have been admitting up through 1964, or that the amendment would reduce the figure to 290,000.

I have no objection to making it 300,000. I do not want to become bogged down with a feeling that we are cutting 200,000 or 300,000—300,000 is all right with me.

The point is that we are going to increase the total number under this bill, starting in July 1968, by 40,000, 50,000, 60,000, or 70,000. I believe that is a point that ought to be clearly brought out.

I regret that I was not acquainted with the total increase that would come in under the bill until day before yesterday. It may be that these figures were all brought out in the hearings. Senators sitting in those hearings would be familiar with it, but I do not believe it is easily found in the committee report. It can be found, but it takes quite a bit of digging to do it.

The press releases and newspaper articles on this subject have all dealt with the national origins system, and there has been discussion about putting a limitation on the Western Hemisphere. All I have seen in the press is the increase over and above what we are talking about now.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would feel that I had performed a disservice to Senators unless I made clear the implication of the bill.

We introduced the bill. It came before the Senate last Friday. I made a speech to enlighten the American people on the subject. During that speech I said that there would be some increase in total immigration to the United States of 50,000 to 60,000 a year. This would result by changing the law to a worldwide system from a nation-by-nation system. These are the numbers that go unused each year. Many quotas are going to countries where they are not utilized.

We shall use about 60,000 more for immediate relatives. It is the 60,000 for immediate relatives that is the subject of the Senator from Iowa. These are family people—brothers and sisters; husbands and wives; fathers and sons.

This subject was gone into by the committee. If the Senator from Iowa failed to appreciate that fact and did not recognize that fact I am sorry but, it is a matter which has been clearly outlined in the RECORD.

I believe we have examined this subject. I have no further comments to make.

If the Senator is interested in a vote, I am prepared to vote.

Mr. MILLER. Before we vote, I would like to continue with what I was saying.

Before I do, I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that my comments were not directed at him in any form of criticism regarding the increase under the pending bill.

But I point out to him that there are many Senators not yet familiar with this matter. He made the point that I came in at the last minute with an amendment.

I want him to understand why. While I do not care if an amendment comes in at the last minute, a day before, or a year before, the important thing is the amendment. If it is a good amendment, it ought to be adopted. I do not believe that the fact that it is brought in at the last minute necessarily means it is not a good amendment.

I am sorry that because of the nature of things, I did not know about this increase. My lack of appreciation of this fact is shared by many Senators. This is not said in criticism of the Senator from Massachusetts. It is in the nature of things that arise in complicated pieces of legislation.

As I understand, in the contemplation of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], it is not envisioned that any people coming in under this bill are to become public charges. They will have their skills; otherwise they will not be admitted. I recognize that there is no intention to bring in people who will be public charges.

This question is not at issue in this amendment. All of this has been gone into in the course of this legislation and the Sentor from Iowa is satisfied on this point. It has nothing to do with my amendment.

But I would suggest that when it comes to considering whether or not we can absorb some of these people into our employment picture, there is involved only 10 percent of the 17,000 or 170,000 people we are talking about.

I would not find too much difficulty if only 17,000 people were involved. We are talking about 290,000 plus another 65,000 people.

Finally, I wish to make it clear with respect to relatives, children, and spouses of our citizens, that my amendment has

nothing to do with them, because they come off the top; they are the first to come in under the 170,000. They are not the last ones, and they are not left off. Then, after that, there are those other preference priorities who come in.

As a result of our conversation, so that objections of the Senator from Massachusetts may be fully met, and so that it may be made clear that other family relationships are not interfered with by my amendment, I modify my amendment by striking the period at the end of the amendment and inserting a semicolon and adding the following: "and provided further that such reduction shall only affect the numbers admitted under section 203(a)(8)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senator so modifies his amendment.

Mr. MILLER. This makes clear that if there are any reductions, they will come only from the nonpreference category and have nothing to do with family relationships whatever—with the sons and daughters, husbands and wives, or any of the others about whom the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa are concerned. Nor would it affect members of the professions and skills and refugees from Communists.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendment is a fair amendment. I would hope that the Senator from Massachusetts would see fit to take the amendment to conference and see what can be done about it, because I do believe it relieves the problems with which he and I are both concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have commented earlier on the thrust of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. I am opposed to it.

The percentages we are discussing were the subject of hearings and discussions. They have been allocated as mentioned in the bill, as follows: The first category, 20 percent, or 34,000 members to unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; second category, 20 percent, or 34,000 for spouses, unmarried sons or daughters of aliens; third category, 10 percent, or 17,000 for professionals; fourth category, 10 percent, or 17,000 for married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; fifth category, 24 percent, or 40,800 for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; sixth category, 10 percent, or 17,000 for skilled or unskilled labor in short supply; seventh category, 6 percent or 10,200 for refugees; the remainder is for nonpreference or "new seed" immigrants.

These are the percentages which have been arrived at by the subcommittee and the committee after extensive and exhaustive hearings.

I do not depreciate the importance of bringing an amendment to the floor in the final hour, if it is a worthwhile amendment. However, one so basic to the whole structure of the bill and the allocations of visa numbers does a disservice to the concern and consideration that the subcommittee and the full committee gave to these allocations.

Therefore I urge that the amendment not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 458

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a revised version of my amendment No. 458 and ask that it be considered in place of the original amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At an appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. —. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person involuntarily brought physically into the United States by the United States Government or its agents shall subsequently be deported from the United States, except prisoners of war as defined by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War dated at Geneva, August 12, 1949."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, under this amendment, I propose to add to the law the following provision:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person involuntarily brought physically into the United States by the U.S. Government or its agents shall subsequently be deported from the United States, except prisoners of war as defined by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War dated at Geneva, August 12, 1949.

The modification has added at the end of the original amendment a provision which excepts prisoners of war who may be brought into the United States such as occurred during the Second World War. Other than this modification, the amendment remains as it was originally introduced.

This amendment means precisely what it says. No person, except a prisoner of war, who is brought involuntarily into the United States by the U.S. Government could be subsequently deported. The amendment would not be limited to cases of extradition, but would be specifically directed at cases in which, not extradition, but direct force is the method used to bring persons into the United States.

There is now nothing on the law books which deals in any way with situations of this type. Insofar as I know, there has been no occasion in past years in which the U.S. Government has engaged in activity which would be covered by this amendment. Unfortunately, it appears from newspaper reports that such an incident did occur on approximately September 8 of this year.

The incident, if accurately reported, is one of the most shameful exhibitions ever charged against the U.S. Government.

According to press reports, the following sequence of events occurred in the Dominican Republic. A proposal advanced by the Organization of the American States, which the press has characterized as bearing the stamp, "Made in U.S.A.," was signed by the rebel forces in the Dominican Republic. Those opposing the rebels refused to sign it. This agreement, in addition to establishing an interim government under Mr. Garcia-Godoy, provided that the rebels turn in their weapons to the provisional government. After the agreement was signed, the rebels refused to carry out the agreement so long as General Wessin y Wessin remained in the Dominican Republic. General Wessin was commander of the Armed Forces Training Center of the Dominican Republic. On September 8, the press reports revealed that an attempt had been made by U.S. personnel, identified as David Phillips, of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Lt. Col. Joseph William Wersick, U.S. Army, to bribe Gen. Wessin y Wessin to leave the Dominican Republic. According to the press reports, General Wessin rejected the attempt and denounced it. On the following day, the press reported that General Wessin was arrested by American personnel and, while under arrest, was taken to an American military aircraft, by which he was transported first to Panama and subsequently to Miami, Fla. At the same time, the press reported that General Wessin would be Dominican Consul in Miami. Subsequently, in Miami, General Wessin refused to accept the appointment as Dominican Consul and charged that he had been arrested by U.S. Army personnel and deported to the United States by U.S. officials.

Mr. President, there has appeared no convincing denial by the U.S. Government of these press accounts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of news articles, which I have briefly summarized, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are many factors surrounding the recent events in the Dominican Republic, and the action taken against General Wessin y Wessin, which raise fundamental questions concerning the current policy of the United States of America on the Dominican Republic. One cannot avoid the conclusion that the United States is joining in a policy of appeasement of the rebel forces in the Dominican Republic, and is taking steps which strengthen the hands of the Communists in that island Republic. Quite obviously, the policy of appeasement and accommodation of the Communist forces is continuing to work to our disadvantage.

Despite General Wessin's removal, the press still reports that the Dominican rebels continue in their refusal to surrender their weapons.

Regardless of the wisdom or lack of wisdom which characterizes our current policies in the Dominican Republic, or the degree of the incident's effect on such policy, the heavy-handed treatment of General Wessin constitutes a shameful blot on the record of our Nation in foreign affairs. The circumstances reported, if the act had been committed by private parties, would support a criminal charge of kidnaping. There was not even a pretense of legality under the law of any nation or the law of nations.

The status of General Wessin in the United States is a tenuous one. From the press reports, it would appear that General Wessin was brought into this country prior to the issuance to him, or for him, of any passport or visa. It would appear that a diplomatic visa, if one had been subsequently issued, would have been in order had General Wessin accepted the post of Consul in Miami. This was invalidated, if it ever existed, by his refusal to accept the post. Under the circumstances, it would appear that he is subject to a deportation action by the U.S. Government, should the U.S. Government decide to initiate a deportation procedure. The amendment which I offer would prevent any deportation of General Wessin, or any person in similar circumstances, upon a showing by them that they had been brought involuntarily into the United States by the U.S. Government or its agents.

This amendment would in no way, of course, prevent General Wessin, or other persons similarly situated, from departing voluntarily from the United States. If they should so voluntarily depart, the amendment would not in the future apply if they subsequently also voluntarily returned to the United States.

This amendment would, of course, be little in the way of mitigation of the offense which reportedly has been committed by the U.S. Government against General Wessin. Its adoption, however, would at least indicate to the world that the Congress of the United States was not sympathetic to, and did not endorse, the abusive type of activity reportedly committed by the U.S. Government in this instance.

Mr. President, I do not know General Wessin y Wessin. I have never met him, nor have I ever been in contact with him, directly or indirectly. I do feel that the Congress has an obligation to require of the officials and agents of the U.S. Government that the rights of individuals be respected, whoever the individuals are, and of whatever nationality they may be.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate adopt this amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Sept. 10, 1965]

SHOWDOWN NEARS IN SANTO DOMINGO—REGIME AIDE CALLS WESSIN OBSTACLE TO NORMALCY

(By Paul Hofmann)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 9.—Suspense gripped Dominicans today as a showdown between the new provisional government and armed forces chiefs seemed to be approaching.

At the center of uncertainty was Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, commander of the controversial Armed Forces Training Center. The center's brigade of firstline troops and at least a dozen tanks were still a formidable factor in the Dominican situation after having fought the rebels in the civil war, which formally ended last week.

Provisional President Hector Garcia-Godoy conferred most of the day with U.S. officials and Dominican military commanders at his private residence, discussing how to assert his authority over all the Dominican Armed Forces.

An aide to Dr. Garcia-Godoy said that "General Wessin is the obstacle" to normal Government activity. The aide declared that as long as the general's status was undefined, "much Government business remains at a standstill." The official suggested that the Provisional President's "private talks" might lead to an arrangement with General Wessin.

Rebel leaders have served notice on the provisional government that they consider General Wessin's removal the price of their collaboration in disarming civilians. The reconciliation accord signed here last week under Organization of American States auspices provided that the recovery of arms in the hands of civilians in the rebel zone of Santo Domingo start immediately, and it did not mention any condition.

Virtually no rebel arms have so far been surrendered to the provisional government. The rebels insist they feel threatened as long as General Wessin and like-minded military chiefs remain in command of well-armed troops.

Last night there was some shooting in the rebel zone but nobody appeared to have been hurt. The Inter-American Peace Force received a telephone call assuring it that the rebels meant no harm and were just firing their rifles into the air to celebrate their "farewell to arms." However, the arms remained in rebel hands today.

During the night it was rumored that General Wessin had been or was about to be arrested at his headquarters at the San Isidro air base, 10 miles northeast of Santo Domingo. The rumors were unfounded.

HE DISCLOSES OFFER

General Wessin had alleged that U.S. officials tried to bribe him to leave the country. This morning he disclosed that Dr. Garcia-Godoy had summoned him to the Presidential Palace during the night to offer him "any diplomatic post abroad" if he was ready to leave the country.

The General said that a U.S. official had been present when the Provisional President pleaded with him to go abroad. He added that he had promised an answer today after consulting with his troops.

Those consulted by President Garcia-Godoy during the day included Ellsworth Bunker, the U.S. member of the OAS peacemaking commission, and the U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

In the rebel sector about 200 youngsters demonstrated against alleged brutality by Dominican Armed Forces officers.

The rebellion erupted April 24 with the proclaimed * * * restoring Juan Bosch, who had been ousted in 1963, to the Presidency. The government of Donald Reid Cabral was deposed during the revolt and the rebels and their military opponents both set up regimes, which resigned under the reconciliation accord in favor of the provisional government.

In the early days of the revolt the United States landed troops in the Dominican Republic. The troops later were incorporated into an Inter-American Peace Force.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 9, 1965]

DOMINICAN REPORTS U.S. BRIBE OFFER—GENERAL SAYS OFFICIALS WANT HIM TO GET OUT OF COUNTRY

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 8.—Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin said today two U.S. Embassy officials told him he would lack for nothing if he agreed to leave the Dominican Republic.

The rebels are trying to get Wessin, who led the armed forces against them when the revolution broke out last April, out of the country.

The general said the Embassy officials offered to purchase his home for $50,000, and said he could have military attaché jobs in Paris or Madrid. He said he declined the offer.

The U.S. Embassy said there would be no comment immediately but it might have something to say later.

REBELS DEMAND REMOVAL

Wessin emphasized he would not retire from the Army until the Dominican situation had become normal and an elected government was in power.

Wessin's remarks came amid speculation the provisional government headed by President Hector Garcia-Godoy was about to retire him or transfer him to some diplomatic job abroad.

Rebel leaders and sympathizers are demanding the removal of Wessin, 42, claiming he ordered the bombing of innocent civilians at the height of the Dominican fighting last April. Wessin has said only rebel military positions were attacked.

DISARMING AT STANDSTILL

Top rebel officials recently have said the success of the civilian disarmament program under the Organization of American States peace formula depends on Wessin's future status. The disarming of civilians in the rebel zone is reported to be at a standstill.

The general, who entered the service as a private in 1944, said four different attempts at what he called bribery were made by American officials, the last one during the past week.

Talking to reporters at his headquarters at San Isidro Air Base, the general declined to reveal the identity of the two persons involved in the first two attempts because, he said, he held them in the highest esteem.

IMPROPER HOUR

The persons calling him last week, he said, were David Phillips, whom he identified as an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Lt. Col. Joseph William Weyrick, Army attaché.

"They came at midnight," said Wessin, "an improper hour to call on a humble Dominican home. Phillips did not say he was with the CIA, but I checked that later and was told that he was.

"He offered to purchase my home and said I would be a guest of honor at the American installations in Panama. He said I could visit all U.S. Army posts and proposed that I could be military attaché in Madrid or military attaché in Paris. He assured me I would lack nothing.

"It's interesting to point out that I am quite willing to sell my home to anyone who wants to give me $50,000 for it because it isn't worth it. But with that money I would immediately build another home in this country."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 10, 1965]

WESSIN OUSTED, REPORTED NAMED CONSUL IN MIAMI

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 9.—Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin was

taken by armed escorts to a waiting U.S. military plane tonight and flown out of the Dominican Republic.

President Hector Garcia-Godoy then took to radio and television to announce he had appointed the militant anti-Communist leader consul-general in Miami, Fla.

IN LINE WITH OFFER

The new job appeared to be in line with the President's offer yesterday to give Wessin y Wessin, leader of the coup that ousted President Juan D. Bosch in 1963, any job he wanted abroad if he would get out of the country.

At the same time, Garcia-Godoy said there would be no further changes in the country's armed forces. This was taken to mean that Commodore Francisco Rivera Caminero had been confirmed as Secretary of the Armed Forces.

The provisional government had puzzled all day over what to do with Wessin y Wessin, who had refused the President's job abroad offer.

The rebels had demanded his ouster as commander of the armed forces training center as part of their price for a peace settlement. Rebel leaders said they could not undertake disarmament on their side until he left.

The rebels accused Wessin y Wessin of having ordered the bombing of Santo Domingo during last April's fighting, and they called it genocide. Wessin y Wessin denied the charge.

ESCORTED TO CAR

The climax came during the evening when the top officers of the inter-American peace force here, Brazilian Gen. Hugo Panasco Alvin, and U.S. Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., called on Wessin y Wessin at his home.

They were accompanied by Commodore Rivera.

They all talked together for about 50 minutes.

Wessin y Wessin emerged in his green fatigue uniform, hatless and unarmed, and was escorted to a waiting car filled with unidentified Dominican army officers.

They drove him to U.S. 82d Airborne Division headquarters at San Isidro Air Base and from there he was whisked to the four-engine transport which had been waiting 6 hours.

He tried to hide his face as he was escorted to the plane. Four Dominican officers went as far as the plane's door with him then returned.

A spokesman said the plane's destination was the Panama Canal Zone.

In his speech, Garcia-Godoy said Wessin y Wessin had retired from the armed forces and accepted the consular position.

RELUCTANT TO MOVE

Garcia-Godoy was reluctant to move against the general because of his wide following among the military and among politicians who regarded him as a bulwark against communism.

Authoritative sources said Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador, and General Palmer were present when the President offered the diplomatic job. Wessin y Wessin himself claimed two members of the U.S. Embassy offered him $50,000 for his home plus a job abroad if he would get out of the country. He said his home was worth only half that.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 13, 1965]

WESSIN BLAMES REDS FOR OUSTER

MIAMI, FLA.—Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, charging that Communists were responsible for his ouster, has agreed to assume duties here in a diplomatic post for the Dominican Republic's provisional government.

Stripped of his command of the armed forces training center, Wessin arrived Friday night after an abrupt and unceremonious departure from his home in Santo Domingo. He flew here in a U.S. Air Force plane from Panama.

In his first meeting with newsmen since the provisional government ousted him as part of the price of peace, Wessin said his removal was "a victory for the Communists." He added, "They haven't knocked me out yet.

"I will serve (as consul general) but in the meantime we are not finished with the Communists in the Dominican Republic, so I can't be happy."

Wessin led the 1963 military coup that overthrew President Juan D. Bosch. He commanded the army during last April's revolution.

Insurgent leaders accused him of ordering the indiscriminate bombing of civilians in the rebel sector of Santo Domingo. Wessin denied the charge, saying military targets only were bombed.

His ouster was demanded by the insurgents as part of their price for a peace settlement.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 15, 1965]

WESSIN BLASTS AMERICAN POLICY

MIAMI, FLA., September 14.—The Dominican Republic's Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin said tonight he was expelled from his country by a U.S. Army lieutenant who held a bayonet at his back.

The militant anti-Communist said he was not even given time to get his passport or see his family.

In his six-page letter to the new government in Santo Domingo announcing he would not take a job as consul general here, Wessin y Wessin also blasted U.S. policy in his homeland.

"The American official who ordered my expulsion in such a humiliating way has given the coupe de grace to the fight for democracy in Latin America," said Wessin y Wessin.

"Can you imagine how the Latin military men feel now?" Wessin y Wessin asked.

The letter was dated September 10, the day he arrived in Miami on a forced trip from Santo Domingo via Panama in a U.S. Air Force plane.

"An elementary sense of honor as a military man prevents me from accepting the appointment of general consul in Miami from a government which has used foreign troops to exile me by force," he said.

He said he didn't want to criticize all Americans, "but I hope and I trust that very soon there will be a change in the American policies concerning my country."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1965]

REBELS UNMOVED BY WESSIN'S EXILE—THEY REFUSE TO YIELD ARMS TILL OTHER GENERALS LEAVE

(By Paul Hofmann)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 10.—Dominican leftist leaders said today that the departure of Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin from the country was not a sufficient concession for the surrender of their arms to the provisional government.

La Patria, newspaper of the rebel movement, charged in an editorial that the provisional President, Dr. Héctor Garcia-Godoy, had "rewarded" General Wessin by appointing him consul general in Miami. General Wessin has been the leftists' leading enemy since last April and May, when he rallied rightwing forces to combat the revolution.

La Patria criticized Dr. Garcia-Godoy for his declaration, issued last night in a broadcast to the nation, that for the time being no other military leaders would be replaced.

General Wessin left the country last night aboard a U.S. transport plane. U.S. officials and military officers had been increasingly active in the last few days in persuading the general to go abroad.

OTHER COMMANDS INTACT

The cooperation of other Dominican military chiefs was obtained with an understanding that they would, at least provisionally, retain their commands. Dr. Garcia-Godoy and his advisers appeared to hope that the departure of General Wessin would prompt leftist civilians to give up their arms.

Under the reconciliation act that was signed last week by the rebels and the Dominican junta, the provisional government was charged with starting "at once" to recover the many weapons in the hands of civilians, most of them in the downtown rebel sector of Santo Domingo.

In the last few days, public displays of weapons in the downtown area have gradually diminished. Some military and paramilitary rebel formations have withdrawn the arms from their members, but none of the weapons have been handed over to the new government.

In his broadcast, Dr. Garcia-Godoy pledged to safeguard civil rights and disclosed that he had ordered the armed forces to withdraw to their quarters. The order affects especially the troops that were under General Wessin's command. Some of the forces have started leaving the northern parts of the capital, where they had been stationed a short distance from the rebel zone.

While Communists and other extreme leftists kept pressing the provisional government for more measures to curb the armed forces, moderate leaders appeared willing to give Dr. Garcia-Godoy credit for having tried to assert his authority and bring about a reconciliation. An attempt to stage an anti-Government demonstration in the rebel zone in the morning attracted only a few dozen youngsters.

There are signs that the Dominican Revolutionary Party of former President Juan Bosch is appraising Dr. Garcia-Godoy's efforts more positively than are the rebel extremists. Dr. Bosch was expected to return from exile Sunday, but it is now suggested that he may prefer to return September 25, on the second anniversary of his ouster by the armed forces.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1965]

WESSIN IN CANAL ZONE

BALBOA, CANAL ZONE, September 10.—Brigadier General Wessin arrived in the Canal Zone from Santo Domingo today aboard a U.S. Air Force plane. He later left for Miami after staying at a U.S. Army guest house in Fort Amador, on the bank of the Panama Canal near Balboa.

[From the Pompano Beach (Fla.) Sun Sentinel, Sept. 15, 1965]

WESSIN SAYS OUSTER BACKED BY BAYONET—UNITED STATES ROLE IN SWITCH BLISTERED

MIAMI.—Ousted Dominican Gen. Elias Wessin, breaking a 4-day silence since his arrival here, Tuesday night rejected the post of consul in Miami and released a blistering attack on the United States.

In a 6-page letter to provisional President Hector Garcia-Godoy, Wessin said he was "deported from my country with a bayonet at my back" by American forces last Thursday night.

"The American officials who ordered my expulsion from Dominican territory in such a humiliating manner have given the coup d'grace to the fight for democracy in the Americas," the letter said.

"Can you imagine the impact this action against my person on the part of the OAS

(Organization of American States) and the U.S. Government will have on Latin American military men?" the letter asked.

The letter, dated September 10, was written shortly after Wessin's arrival here last Friday night aboard a U.S. military plane from the Panama Canal Zone. Wessin had been mysteriously flown to the Canal Zone from Santo Domingo in another U.S. military plane 24 hours before.

Wessin said he withheld release of the letter until now to assure time for its delivery to Garcia-Godoy by a personal courier.

Copies of the letter also were sent to Brazilian Gen. Hugo Panasco Alvin, commander in chief of the inter-American peace forces in Santo Domingo; Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, the top U.S. military commander there; Elsworth Bunker, U.S. member of the special OAS negotiating team, and to the commander of the U.S. airborne forces in the Dominican Republic.

Wessin said that Generals Alvin and Palmer told him that he was to become consul in Miami.

"An elementary sense of honor as a military man prevents me from accepting the post of consul general in Miami from a government which has allowed foreign troops to send me into exile by force," he said in the letter.

"I told this to Generals Alvin and Palmer when they told me that I was consul in Miami.

"The afternoon when Generals Alvin and Palmer informed me that I had to go and a U.S. Army lieutenant prevented me from going to my home to get my clothes and my passport I firmly decided not to serve your government, not in the Miami Consulate or in any other post."

By ousting him, Wessin said American troops were guilty of "making common cause with the enemies (the Communists) of democracy" and said the action did not befit "those who say they are the leaders in the fight for the survival of the Western World."

The general said he was here without money and without passport. "But I maintain my dignity and my name."

"My departure from our country portends grave happenings for the cause of democracy," he warned. "What Dominican military man, who respects himself, will be willing to assume responsibilities when communism launches its final attack against our nation?"

To accept the consulate here, he said, "would be to place myself at the service of a government which has betrayed Dominican democracy and would constitute disloyalty to those brave soldiers and officers who stood by me in those tragic days when blood soaked the soil of our fatherland."

Despite his angry blast at the United States, Wessin said he did not want to give "ammunition" to the Communists to use against the United States.

He said he "repudiates the action of those bad Americans who are causing this great nation to lose prestige, and I trust there soon will be salutary rectification concerning the mistaken policy which has been followed in my country."

Wessin cautioned García that any "injustices" against members of the Dominican Armed Forces will bring two consequences.

[From U.S. News & World Report]

DOMINICAN PUZZLE—HAS UNITED STATES TURNED OVER A NATION TO THE REDS?—TWO SIDES

(NOTE.—In April, President Johnson rushed marines to the Dominican Republic to save American lives, prevent Reds from taking over a revolution. Five months later, a temporary Dominican President is in office. United States has exiled the leader of anti-Communist military forces. The Communists continue to wield considerable power. And American troops are still there to guard an uncertain truce. This question is raised: Who really won in the Dominican Republic—United States or Communists? Howard Handleman of U.S. News & World Report, who has covered the Dominican crisis from the start, gives the inside story.)

SANTO DOMINGO.—This is the story of the first days under the new Government of the Dominican Republic. That Government, headed by Héctor García Godoy, was set up on September 3 under a compromise arranged by the Organization of American States.

During the days that followed, the rebels seemed to be having things all their own way. They retained control of their own zone—downtown Santo Domingo. Government police and troops didn't even try to get in. They retained control of their arms—thousands of rifles and machineguns that they captured in the first days of the revolution, back in April.

The antirebel station run by the military at the San Isidro airbase was ordered off the air. There was no other voice to counter the Communist propaganda of the newspaper Patria, published in the rebel zone.

Rebel officials got jobs in the Government of García Godoy, including Cabinet posts. Rebels made demands on García Godoy—he made no public demands on them.

Brig. Gen. Elías Wessin y Wessin, dedicated anti-Communist, was hustled out of the country in an American Air Force transport plane.

The General was put aboard under the watchful eye of five armed FBI agents and a large detachment from the 82d Airborne Division.

The whole atmosphere was one of rebel, or Communist, victory.

Downtown, in the rebel zone, people sang revolutionary songs. Groups of rebel warriors marched through the streets chanting revolutionary slogans.

In contrast, outside the rebel zone, there were no such celebrations or victory claims.

Instead, there was gloom. Some American businessmen pulled up stakes and left. Others requested transfers, or tried to settle their affairs so they could leave. Dominican anti-Communists, too, were down in the mouth. Some diplomats, from Europe and Latin America, were convinced that all was lost to the Communists.

As an example of the general gloom, an American resident told me: "You are here for a historic event—the first time that the American Army occupied a country in order to turn it over to the Communists."

A DIPLOMAT'S VIEW

One important Ambassador of a non-Latin country said:

"Please tell me one single thing that is better for your country now than it was last April, when you sent in the marines. The Communists are stronger now than they ever have been in this country. They have come out in the open, publish their own newspaper, hold conventions, even call themselves Communist, openly.

"All the concessions are being made to the Communists—none to the other side. The rebels signed the compromise agreement to settle the civil war—but now they ask for more concessions before they will live up to their agreements. First it was Wessin y Wessin. Next it will be the other military chiefs. Already, the street mobs are demanding that they go. They are calling your Ambassador, Mr. W. Tapley Bennett, a Nazi—and demanding that he be kicked out.

"Their gall is enormous. In one edition of Patria, the Communists bragged in one statement that they were the power in the revolution—and, in another column, attacked Mr. Bennett for saying in April that Communists were threatening to seize control of the revolution.

"In these months of revolution, the Communists have built up their political and military apparatus far beyond anything they ever had here before.

"Also, the rebels now have the mystique—the glamor and prestige that go with standing up to the giants of the hemisphere and the world—the Yankees. They have the heroes and the legends and the slogans and the songs. They think they have won this revolution.

"I am afraid they are right."

This Ambassador knows what the Americans are trying to do here—divide the rebels and then conquer them. He just doesn't think it will work. The Americans believe their formula does have a chance to work.

WHAT THE REBELS DIDN'T GET

To American officials, rebel gains at this point seem more apparent than real. The first job was to clean house on the right. Now the rebel turn is coming.

Rebels have not been granted any one of their fundamental demands.

The America's officials say this:

When talks about a compromise settlement opened, the rebels plopped six basic demands on the table. Not a single one was accepted. The demands were:

Withdraw the Inter-American Peace Force immediately.

Fire all Dominican military chiefs of staff.

Name a rebel officer as Dominican Army Chief of Staff.

Let the military men who joined the rebels return to their services with the advanced ranks to which the rebels promoted them.

Restore the 1963 constitution of Juan Bosch.

Reseat the Congress elected in the Bosch sweep of 1962.

Acceptance of these demands would have meant a rebel victory. The United States is pleased that a compromise was signed—without giving in on any one of these demands.

The Inter-American Peace Force troops stay, indefinitely. The military chiefs of staff stay, at least for now. Wessin was not a chief of staff.

The Juan Bosch constitution is not accepted—and a new one is to be written.

No rebel officer gets high command. Officers who fought for the rebels return to the military—with the ranks they held on April 24, not with the ranks the rebels gave them. A new Congress is to be elected.

Biggest thing working against the Communists, in the U.S. view, is the continued presence of 82d Airborne Division troops. American officials here, privately, express the hope that the troopers will be kept here at least for the 9 months that the provisional government of García Godoy is in power.

A START BY GARCÍA GODOY

American officials are pleased with the start García Godoy has made. He is anti-Communist. He is consolidating his position with the military and explained to officers in advance why he had to get rid of Wessin. He is firming up ties with the influential "Santiago group" of businessmen. Early in the summer, United States tried to help this group form a provisional government. Now the United States is pleased that the group is helping García Godoy.

Among the things U.S. officials like about García Godoy are:

His firm stand against General Wessin. One U.S. official summed up American objections to Wessin by saying, "He is so rigidly anti-Communist that he creates more Communists than he destroys."

García Godoy's efforts to weaken the rebel side by giving good Government jobs to rebels who show signs of concern about

Communist power downtown. These former rebels are watched carefully during their period of "rehabilitation." One already has been kicked out of the job of running the Government radio-TV station.

Garcia Godoy's care to avoid actions so drastic that they carry too much risk of touching off new fighting.

The U.S. objective is to destroy the Communist power—without getting into another shooting war. Idea is to break the rebel hold on the downtown section, and have as many guns collected as possible, before even considering armed action. Garcia Godoy shares these objectives.

United States is willing to wait a week or two to break the rebel hold on downtown, and collect guns. But it is recognized that, in the end, it may be necessary to send in Dominican troops and search every house for weapons.

Possibility of a pitched battle between Communist and non-Communist forces inside the rebel camp is not ruled out. There have been gunfights between these forces inside the rebel zone from time to time.

ACE IN THE HOLE?

As a result, there now is a tendency among American officials to look on the rebel "president," Col. Francisco Caamaño Deño, as an ace in the hole, on our side.

Conviction is that Caamaño doesn't want the Communists to grab power any more than Garcia Godoy does.

Caamaño pledged that he would begin delivering guns soon. He also, according to U.S. officials, has gone back into the Army—and accepts Garcia Godoy as his commander in chief.

Others share the growing conviction that Caamaño will turn out to be an important factor against communism.

A Dominican nationalist, prorebel and anti-Yankee, says: "One of the strange things about this situation is that the only man who can save this country from communism, for you Yankees, is Caamaño—and I think he will."

A ROLE FOR REVOLUTIONISTS?

The role of Caamaño is just one of the things that make the Dominican problem so complicated. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, member of the OAS ad hoc committee that arranged the compromise settlement, has confided to several people that this has been the most complex problem which he ever has tackled.

The reasons are multiple—and obvious.

Thirty years of Trujillo's dictatorship, to start with, sapped the spirit of the whole people. It was difficult to find anybody who would make a decision or take a stand.

The rebel forces were split into a number of splinter groups—moderates and non-Communist nationalists of various persuasions, plus Communists who follows the Chinese, Moscow or Castro lines and fight among themselves.

On the other side, there was a lack of political effectiveness.

Old Trujillistas tried to muscle in, and did gain influence over the junta president, Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras. Old militarists jealously guarded their power and privilege.

Economically, the country is shot.

Cheating on the Government was a national pastime. Contraband was smuggled in by the military—and merchants. For political reasons, leaders who came after Trujillo inflated wages. At the same time, the props were knocked from under the Dominican export business by the collapse of world market prices for sugar, coffee and cacao.

To straighten out the mess, it now seems clear, the United States will have to remain deeply involved in Dominican internal affairs for a long time to come.

Economically, the United States is going to have to keep the country afloat.

Politically, the United States already is deeply involved. President Garcia Godoy already is getting political advice from U.S. officials here—although he does not accept it all.

As an example, U.S. officials have objected to several appointments Garcia Godoy has made to his Cabinet, or to other high Government jobs. Garcia Godoy has rejected the U.S. protests, for the most part.

One of his main explanations to American officials who object is this: Non-Communists in the rebel camp must not be isolated, forced to side with the Communists. They must be given another way to go. He wants to offer them that "other way."

Therefore, he says, he is appointing as many moderates and non-Communists, from the rebel camp, as he can.

American officials are not 100 percent satisfied that this tactic will work—but are willing to let Garcia Godoy give it a try. After all, American troops still are in the country, as insurance against a Communist takeover.

The Garcia Godoy tactic is to divide and conquer—which is the U.S. tactic here, too.

THE DOUBLECROSS: A WAY OF LIFE

Involved in this tactic, of course, is the grand old practice of the doublecross. And the doublecross is a grand old Dominican habit, from way back. It is even contagious. Americans have caught the spirit, here, from time to time.

Some examples of the doublecross in this revolution:

Before the revolution, Imbert feared that former President Joaquin Balaguer, his political enemy, planned a coup. Imbert, though an anti-Communist, made a deal with the Castroite 14th of June movement—even gave it arms.

During the first week in May, the U.S. decided Imbert was the man to form an anti-Communist junta. Former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin was sent in to persuade Imbert—who really was reluctant, wanted no part of the mess. Mr. Martin denies it now, but some U.S. officials believe that he promised Imbert that the United States would recognize his junta, and help it. The United States had no such intention.

Once the junta was formed, Imbert and the military chiefs vowed to stand together to the end. Then, by accident, Imbert learned the chiefs were talking to Mr. Bunker—the OAS negotiator—behind Imbert's back.

The rebels signed two cease-fire agreements—and kept neither.

The rebels signed the compromise peace—then made new demands before they would live up to the agreement.

It's a way of life in Santo Domingo—this doublecross.

The doublecross has to be stressed for one reason. If the tradition of the doublecross is not kept firmly in mind, too much weight might be given to the present promises and agreements.

Ambassador Bunker and his OAS colleagues found this out during the months that they worked to get a compromise political settlement. Promises made one day were broken the next.

For this reason, Americans discussing the chances of getting a settlement in fact, as well as on paper, always preface their discussions with the assurance that the American Army is in the country to protect American interests, if it has to.

U.S. officials make no bones about the fact that they hope the American Army stays in the Dominican Republic for at least 9 months—the full term of the Garcia Godoy government. Some say they hope the troops stay even longer than that.

ANTICOMMUNISTS, TOO, COULD MAKE TROUBLE

Elements of future trouble are present almost everywhere. Not only are the Communists organizing action groups around the country, and stockpiling weapons, but so are anti-Communist followers of Wessin y Wessin.

In this situation, President Garcia Godoy is moving slowly. He has to, in order to avoid touching off new fighting that will blow up the whole effort to restore law and order and set up a stable government.

He would like to crack down on the Communist newspaper, Patria, for example. But he can't risk it right now. Instead, he hopes the two big papers, El Caribe and Listin Diario, can resume publishing as soon as possible, so the people have something to read other than Communist propaganda. The two big papers have not published since the start of the revolution. Now the unions, presumably following Communist orders, are keeping them shut down by making exorbitant demands. Unions are demanding full pay for the 4 months that the papers were closed and had no income. Extremists in the unions also talk of handing the papers over to worker ownership and control—although they call it "people's" ownership.

Other things, too, bother U.S. officials.

Asked whether the Dominicans would be ready for elections in 9 months, one official gave a one-word answer: "No." Juan Bosch bothers the United States, too. To the U.S. Embassy people, Bosch is bad news. They blame him for much of what has gone on this summer. To them, he was a poor administrator, as president in 1963. He did things that helped Communists, like letting some of the most dangerous return from exile. Officials say his constitution of 1963 is a horror, with wording so vague that it gives the President almost any powers he wants to assume. He is anti-Yankee. He pits class against class. The bill of particulars against him goes on and on. Right now, it is thought, Bosch has lost a lot of political popularity. But Bosch is a spellbinder, who, in the opinion of U.S. diplomats, can win back much of his former popularity with a few speeches. Also disturbing to Americans is the return of exiled revolutionaries.

Concern was centered on Maximo Lopez Molina, president of the Chinese-line MPD, or Popular Dominican Movement. Lopez Molina had spent some time in Japan, recently moved to China, and had left China for the Dominican Republic when the provisional government was formed—or seemed certain to be formed. The Institutional Act of the provisional government, written jointly by the OAS ad hoc committee and Dominicans of both sides, bans deportation or exile. By September 7, Lopez Molina had reached Kingston, Jamaica. A way was found, next day, however, to block him. Lopez Molina was shipped to Paris, where he maintains his permanent home in exile. Other key Communists, however, have returned.

Garcia Godoy is working hand in glove with the Americans, and his goals apparently coincide with the main U.S. goals—unless, of course, there is another doublecross in the works.

U.S. officials here in Santo Domingo still talk about the beating they took from some of the U.S. press at the outset back in April, when Ambassador Bennett issued a call for the marines.

They continue to point out newly revealed evidence of Communist power within the rebel camp, to support their conclusion that U.S. intervention was necessary to save lives and keep the Communists from grabbing power.

U.S. intelligence now can demonstrate that nearly all the Communists who were listed as active when the revolt started still are important in the rebel zone.

AN INTERVIEW WITH WESSIN

Now we come to the case of Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin. On Tuesday, September 7, the story broke that American officials had offered Wessin a bribe to leave the country.

That morning an anti-Communist Dominican newspaperman got me in to see Wessin—when four carloads of other newsmen were stopped at the outside gates.

The general said that two Americans had offered to buy his $18,000 home—at any price he named—if he would leave the country and take a tour, as honored guest, of military establishments in Panama and the United States. Wessin said his reply was that he would sell his home for $50,000, gladly, but that he would use the money to build another and better home, right in front of the old one.

Later that day, another high-ranking Dominican officer told me more about the case. He said that the CIA chief in Santo Domingo and an American military attaché went to Wessin's home at 2:30 a.m. on Sunday, September 5, with the bribe offer.

Next day, high U.S. officials told me a different story. They said no bribe had been offered, that Wessin initiated the meeting—but it was not at 2:30 in the morning. "It was much earlier than that." There had been other meetings, too. But Wessin asked for each of these, too.

Piecing these two stories together with some things American officials told later, I think the story is this:

United States through Garcia Godoy, put the pressure on Wessin to get out of the country. Wessin dickered, explained he was a poor man, would have to sell his home, liquidate other assets. During the negotiations Wessin initiated individual meetings. Wessin did tell me that he, himself, set the price of $50,000 on his home.

The story of the physical ouster of Wessin, at 8:05 on the evening of Thursday, September 9, reads like a paperback spy novel. Sometime during the night of September 8–9, Wessin began moving his tanks from the northern part of Santo Domingo back toward his base. He did not inform the inter-American military headquarters in advance.

There was panic. Ambassador Bunker was pulled out of bed before 4:30 on Thursday morning. He was out of the hotel before 7. He didn't return until 5 in the afternoon.

Wessin's moves were confusing. On Wednesday morning he went before NBC cameras and made his bribe charges openly—the same charges that he had confided secretly to me only 24 hours earlier.

At the same time, Wessin seemed to be yielding to Garcia Godoy's urging that he accept a post abroad for the good of the country. Godoy offered him his choice of several posts. Wessin said, on Wednesday, that he would consider them, and made a date to visit Godoy and give his answer on Thursday morning.

Wessin didn't show up for that date with his commander in chief.

Somebody ordered the Inter-American Peace Force into action—presumably Mr. Bunker. Brig. Gen. John R. Deane, assistant division commander of the 82d Airborne, was sent to Wessin's office. By all accounts, there was a scene. Then, Wessin was escorted to General Deane's headquarters. He was hustled out, an American officer on each arm, and whisked back to his own headquarters, a few miles away.

Later, in the afternoon, an American Air Force C–130 landed at San Isidro. Some baggage was put aboard. U.S. soldiers and plainclothesmen, presumably FBI, guarded the plane. After dark, just before 8 p.m., Wessin arrived by U.S. helicopter, was rushed aboard the airplane, and flown off to Panama. His family was left behind. One of his aides, a major, was the only Dominican to see him off.

The "bum's rush" for Wessin had some bad effects.

American residents, as well as Dominicans, began recalling how Wessin had led the forces against the rebels in the first days. A legend began to grow. Wessin was credited with saving the country from communism in the days before the marines landed. Wessin began to seem 9 feet tall.

American military officers have a more solid, less emotional, objection. Most of them had liked Wessin, and admired him as a military man. Generally, they agree his military did hold off the Communists in April until the marines landed. It is the diplomats who criticize his military actions during the first days.

But the main concern the American military men feel, as expressed by an officer who was brought in for a special high-level job, is this: For years, United States has been training Latin-American officers at Fort Gulick in Panama. These officers are indoctrinated with the idea that the United States depends on them as bulwarks against communism. What, asks the officer, are these Latin-American officers going to think about the word of the United States now?

THE REBELS CELEBRATE "VICTORY"

Meanwhile, as General Wessin was being stripped of his military rank, retired from the Army and forced out of the country by the Americans, the rebels were celebrating their "victory."

At rebel headquarters, in the Copello Building on the main business street, El Conde, I talked with Bill Bailes, an American airplane pilot who has been with the rebels almost from the start.

We commented on how the guns had all but disappeared from the streets of the rebel zone. Mr. Bailes said the guns were still there—that the night before, when rumors spread that Wessin was going to invade, guns sprouted everywhere in the streets.

Mr. Bailes was exuberant with what he believes is a rebel victory. He praised the job that had been done by the "American press."

He said, "You reporters saw through the brainwashing of the American Government," and then added, jokingly: "I am recommending that we strike a medal for the American reporters who covered this story."

One of the sources of strength Garcia Godoy hopes to keep, as a counter to the Communists in the rebel forces, is the military.

As of mid-July, the Dominican armed forces had the following strength figures: 10,000 army; 3,800 air force; 3,600 navy; more than 10,000 in national police; 1,700 in Wessin's armed forces training center.

I talked with high-ranking military officers, many of whom were gloomy.

One in particular I had seen several times, in May and July, when the purely military situation was much worse than it is now. But never had I seen him so gloomy.

This officer said:

"The situation is worse than anytime since April.

"During April and May, and into June, you at least could have faith in something—the military effort against communism. Now, even that faith has been shattered. United States seemed to be against the Communists then. Now it doesn't seem to be. United States instead seems to be protecting the Communists.

"Exiled revolutionaries are coming back. Arms are not being collected.

"One provisional government, Imbert's, is out and another one is in—but still the Communists keep their control of downtown Santo Domingo. What did the compromise agreement accomplish?

"The Communists publish their newspapers—but the anti-Communists are ordered off the air, and have no newspapers."

The officer was puzzled by the United States—and said that he felt betrayed, adding:

"We cannot understand your Government. You send thousands to fight communism in Vietnam—but give in to the Communists here."

Neither does this officer think that all the rebel guns will be surrendered or found. He said 2,500 weapons were found in the northern part of the city, after the junta victory in May—but that many others still are there, hidden too well or too deeply to be detected. How many more are being hidden downtown, or in the rest of the country the officer would not try to guess.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

United States now has not only the political and military problems, but the formidable economic problem as well.

Here are some aspects of the aid problem:

Government budget runs $15 million a month. Collections fell to $2 million in May, got up to $9 million in September, are not expected to reach $15 million before many months.

Sugar Corporation, Government-owned, loses money and has to borrow $16 to $18 million a year to operate. Production costs are higher than the low world prices.

Coffee, a prime export, is in trouble. A few years ago, the Dominican Republic cheated on the World Coffee Agreement, exported more than its quota. Now, it is being penalized. In addition, coffee prices on the world market are very low. Result is that the little coffee growers, out in the countryside, aren't able to sell their coffee beans—and don't understand why. That poses a political problem of Garcia Godoy—and the United States.

Cacao prices are down on the world market.

Since Trujillo, the Dominican Republic has been importing more than it can afford. Trujillo was killed in 1961. He had kept a tight rein on imports, showed a yearly favorable balance in current trade accounts. The figures tell the story. Current trade balances, year by year, were: 1960—plus $42.6 million; 1961—plus $41.8 million; 1962—minus $13.5 million; 1963—minus $22.8 million; 1964—minus $55.7 million.

All these problems are manageable, however, compared to the really big one:

This has been a country of easy living. People didn't need peso incomes to live. They could pick bananas and get along. But now that's not good enough for them. They want TV sets, and pesos in their pockets. They want schools for their children, and hospitals. Other people have these things, and they want them too. Only problem is that, while they want the benefits that come from a money economy, they don't really understand yet that they have to work for what they get.

Against these problems, and others, the U.S. mission for the Agency for International Development went to work on estimates of what was needed.

The mission came up with an estimate of 30 millions, to start with. It recommended that United States chip in 20 millions, the Dominican Republic the other 10 millions. President Johnson agreed, announced his $20-million aid program.

Initial planning calls for use of the money in these ways:

Help make up the budget deficits, in monthly operating costs.

Pay half the 1-month salary bonus that all Government employees get in December.

Throw in some money to help rehabilitate manufacturing and business, generally—but not to help commerce.

Finance public works projects. Many already are underway, like the new water system being constructed for Santo

Domingo. But in addition, Garcia Godoy is being given a "pot" of 2 millions to throw into public works in areas where it will do the most good politically. Idea is that United States wants Garcia Godoy to succeed, so U.S. money is being given to him to use for semipolitical purposes.

On September 5, 2 days after the Garcia Godoy government took office, the AID people went over the books with the government. The Dominicans were surprised. They were "wealthier" than they had imagined.

They hadn't heard about President Johnson's promise of $20 million—because there are no newspapers of general information in the capital.

But, in addition to that, they found that they had: 32 millions in loans negotiated by previous governments, but never drawn; 20 to 30 millions in new loans that will be available to finance projects the AID mission now is developing; 6.5 millions in OAS emergency aid that has not been spent yet.

Total aid given since April 24 ran to 42 millions. This was U.S. money, most of which was funneled through OAS.

One reason that 6.5 millions of this aid money has not yet been spent is that United States now is keeping a closer watch than ever on what is done with aid dollars in the Dominican Republic. In the past, officials say, much of the aid money went down the drain, in stopgap measures.

Now, the United States intends to be tougher, and make certain that aid extended will help make it possible to end aid later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that my good friend the senior Senator from South Carolina will not press his amendment.

The Senator from South Carolina makes out a fairly strong case in favor of General Wessin y Wessin. His amendment, however, is an illustration of the fact that it is unwise to pass a general law based on one specific instance.

Under the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, any person who is involuntarily brought into the United States by the United States or its agents cannot be deported. This amendment would cover all persons brought into the United States under those circumstances except prisoners of war.

Frequently the U.S. Coast Guard has the task of preventing smuggling. We have statutes against piracy on the high seas. The way in which this amendment is phrased, it would go far beyond the case of General Wessin y Wessin.

If the Coast Guard were to catch smugglers off the U.S. Coast, against whom they had a case based upon evidence of prior acts, and if the smugglers were brought to our country against their will, even though the smugglers were aliens, they could never be deported from the United States under this amendment.

The same thing would apply to pirates who were aliens and happened to be apprehended by agents of the American Government off the coast of the United States or elsewhere on the high seas.

I suggest to my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina the advisability of withholding his amendment and introducing a separate bill to cover the case of General Wessin y Wessin.

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction of bills which are introduced in behalf of special individuals who are subject to deportation under the general laws. The subcommittee constantly acts on such bills for special individuals in individual cases.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from South Carolina will withdraw his amendment and introduce a special bill to cover General Wessin y Wessin.

There are several members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization present in the Chamber. I am certain that they will join me in assuring the Senator from South Carolina that we would give careful consideration to the case of General Wessin y Wessin in the event the Senator were to see fit to introduce a special bill to take care of his situation. I believe that would be a safer course to follow.

The amendment has not been considered by the subcommittee. The subcommittee has had no opportunity to study the amendment. Certainly the amendment would be subject to the interpretation which I mentioned. This interpretation would prevent the United States from deporting people who are brought into the U.S. waters or into our country in violation of the laws against smuggling or piracy, if we were to apprehend them on the high seas.

I hope the Senator from South Carolina will not press his amendment, but, on the contrary, will introduce a special bill for the benefit of Gen. Wessin y Wessin.

I give the Senator my assurance as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary that I shall give consideration to the merits of the case of Gen. Wessin y Wessin.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the Coast Guard may arrest anyone within our 3-mile limit. That is considered within the waters of the United States, and it would appear that the persons in the Senator's example would be voluntarily within the area of the United States. If they are beyond the national waters of the United States, I do not know of any authority we have to bring them in here. In view of that lack of authority, I do not believe such an amendment would be necessary.

However, if there is any question about it, if the Senator wishes to offer an amendment or would support such an amendment if I offered it, I should be pleased to hear from the manager of the bill as to his views with regard to such an amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in spite of the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator, by his act in modifying his own amendment, has shown that his amendment is subject to further scrutiny and should be further scrutinized.

We have in our laws the doctrine of hot pursuit, relating to smuggling; and under the Senator's amendment, if we followed smugglers outside the 3-mile limit into the ocean and captured them and brought them back here for trial in our courts, they would have a right to remain in the United States, under the amendment, until they shuffled off this mortal coil.

I am not sufficiently gifted in drafting to draft an amendment on the spur of the moment. I only wish the Senator from South Carolina would save us further labor on the point by withdrawing his amendment, and then introducing a special bill for the relief of one man. Whether or not we are able to develop a good case for the relief of Gen. Wessin y Wessin, I do not think we can make out a good case for the proposition that smugglers and pirates involuntarily brought into the United States by U.S. law-enforcement agencies should be allowed to remain in this country forever, and not be subject to deportation.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is not solely to prevent General Wessin from being deported. The Wessin matter is merely an incident which illustrates well what our Government has done in this case. Our Government, at the point of a bayonet, with pistols in the man's back, forced him to come into the United States. From all indications, he did not want to come. He was brought in involuntarily.

Our position is that when our Government does that, the victim of such actions should not be forced to leave unless he wishes to do so.

The Senator has raised a technical question and is, I think, taking a very dubious position. But I should be glad to hear from the manager of the bill as to how he feels about this matter.

Mr. ERVIN. If the Senator will pardon me and if I may be recognized 1 more minute, I remember a relatively short time ago when U.S. law enforcement forces caught a Cuban fishing trawler poaching in the waters off the coast of the United States. They were arrested and brought into the United States against their will, to be tried in court.

Under the Senator's amendment, those poachers would have the right to stay in the United States forever. Many situations of that kind arise. People on rafts are picked up and brought into the United States, sometimes against their will. No matter how undesirable their character, they would have the right to remain in the country. It seems to me that this is an illustration of what I have observed heretofore: We ought not to pass general law on the basis of one instance.

I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that if all the things which have been recounted in the press are true, Gen. Wessin y Wessin has not been fairly dealt with, and a bill for his relief might be appropriate if he wishes to remain in the United States. But I do not believe

the special remedy for such a situation is to tell all the others that they can stay here if they wish, from now on.

I do not know whether the facts reported in the newspapers are true, because I find newspapers sometimes are like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in that they contain about as much fiction as fact. That is the reason why we ought to have a special bill, referred to an appropriate committee, which could then investigate the truth of the press reports.

Mr. THURMOND. Of course, Mr. President, there is no intention to protect smugglers or criminals, but the Cubans to whom the Senator refers were already within U.S. waters, and they were taken to jail.

I should be pleased to hear from the manager of the bill as to his reaction to my amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has raised a number of different points which cast doubt on the total effect of this amendment. I think all of us can remember back, not many years ago, to the time when there was a seizure of a Portuguese ship, and countries throughout the world were notified about the act of piracy which had been committed, and navies all over the world went in search of the ship.

There were people of nine different nationalities aboard that ship, being pursued by units of the U.S. Navy. What would have happened, for example, had that ship been seized and brought to the United States? Could any of the individuals who happened to be on that ship have declared that they were involuntarily brought to the United States, and take advantage of the proposed provision?

Other questions, too, have been raised by the Senator from North Carolina. What I should like to do, knowing how strongly the Senator from South Carolina feels about the issue, is respectfully suggested that the Judiciary Committee hold a hearing on this matter next year, at least to develop, expand, and evaluate it, to see whether this is an appropriate matter for the concern and deliberation of the Senate.

I would be more than delighted to attend such a hearing and to participate in it. I have only been acting chairman of the particular subcommittee that is involved. Final determination would have to be made by our chairman.

However, I recommend to the chairman that he hold such a hearing and extend such a courtesy to the Senator from South Carolina, so that we could examine the subject in some detail and consider it and evaluate it.

I feel that the distinguished chairman of the committee will accord this courtesy to the Senator from South Carolina and to the points that he has raised.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have no desire to force action on the amendment at this time. I wished to focus attention on the subject. It involves the action by our Government in bringing a man into our country from the Dominican Republic at the point of bayonets, against his wishes, and to keep him here at the Government's will, whether he wishes to remain here or not. It is one of the most dastardly acts that has ever been committed by the U.S. Government. Those who committed the act should be required to explain it.

If the Senator in charge of the bill gives assurance that the subject will receive attention at a hearing, and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, feels the subject will receive full exploration—and I should like to hear from him on that point—I shall be willing to withdraw the amendment, to allow the Judiciary Committee to hold full hearings on the subject.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I assure my good friend from South Carolina that I shall do everything in my power to see to it that a hearing is held on such a bill if it is introduced, and that serious consideration be given to the facts to which he has referred in presenting his amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in view of the assurance given by the manager of the bill, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], a member of the Judiciary Committee, I withdraw the amendment. I am sure the Judiciary Committee will consider the subject, as both Senators have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator in charge of the bill will yield to me for a moment for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I am very much interested in this bill. I am impressed with its objectives. I sympathize with all of them. I was deeply impressed with the remarks made yesterday by the Senator from Rhode Island.

In my State, many Greek and Italian families are making great contributions to the progress of South Carolina. They are outstanding citizens.

As I understand the provisions of the pending bill, it would be possible for many additional immigrants from both Greece and Italy to come into the United States—perhaps many of them to settle in South Carolina.

I recall that it was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that many great scientists have made valuable contributions in connection with the development of the atomic bomb; but also, when we came to the period of the hydrogen bomb, there was another distinguished Hungarian refugee, Dr. Edward Teller, who was responsible for that as well as many other great contributions to science.

For that reason, I am sympathetic with the goals established in the pending bill. One point disturbs me a great deal. I fear that the number of immigrants would be substantially increased under the provisions of the pending bill, and I wonder whether it would be possible for the Senator in charge of the bill to consider any reduction from the 170,000 as now contemplated to be authorized under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Early today, I analyzed how we arrived at the 170,000 figure. Briefly, we traced it back to 1924, when the immigration bill was being considered, and the figure set then was 150,000, representing one-sixth of 1 percent of the country's population at that particular time. That figure was increased by some 8,000 as this country recognized newly independent countries and accorded them a small minimum quota. On top of the 158,000 figure, this bill increased by 10,200 the total quota numbers to take care of refugees as defined in the bill, those fleeing from Communist persecution, or fleeing from the Middle East, or natural calamities. This brought the total close to the 170,000 figure.

As the Senator from South Carolina has recognized, this figure does not include those who have close family relationships, so it probably would mean not only 170,000 but also 40,000 or 50,000 in addition because of the close family relationships.

The stress of the bill is on the reunification of families. There was a great deal of debate in the subcommittee at the time of the hearings as to what the figure should be. The figure of 170,000 was arrived at after a considerable amount of "pulling and hauling," so to speak, as to exactly what the figure should be. I believe that it really reflects, not a substantial increase in the numbers that will come in, but the need to reunify and bring families together, as well as people of merit and ability.

At this time, I would hesitate to support any kind of amendment which would alter the basic formula of the 170,000 figure. I might mention to the Senator from South Carolina that the number of immigrants who came into this country in 1924, when this legislation first established the national origins system, represented six-tenths of 1 percent of the U.S. population.

In 1964, the number of immigrants coming into this country in relation to the population was only one-tenth of 1 percent. Therefore, I believe, as related to the total population, that the total number of immigrants has been decreasing. I would expect, with the ceilings which have been established for the 170,000, and the other restrictions which have been applied, that the percentage would constantly decrease—that is, that the number of people who will come in as immigrants compared to the total population of the United States will constantly decrease in the years ahead.

I hope that this explanation will be of some interest to the Senator from South Carolina, but at this time I would hesitate to consider any change in the total figure of 170,000.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I can appreciate the work which the committee has put into this legislation and in arriving at the figure

of 170,000. However, I still have grave doubts about whether we should at this time increase the number of immigrants allowed into our country annually. We have an unemployment problem which we must deal with, and we should limit immigrants to those who have a real reason for coming into this country for family reasons or other pressing humanitarian reasons.

While I have an open mind about altering the national origins quota system, I do have such grave doubts about the wisdom of increasing total immigration, as this bill would do, that I will have to consider seriously casting my vote against the bill unless an amendment is adopted substantially reducing the total number of immigrants.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier in debate the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator in charge of the bill, as well as the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], made comments about the attitude that they and I share with respect to the numerical ceiling on admissions from the Western Hemisphere. I believe that our views, expressed in the filed separate views in the committee report, are adequate and illustrative of our reasoning.

However, as we approach final passage of the pending bill, I wish to acknowledge concerns which have been voiced, particularly by public officials and editorials in the Dominion of Canada, Michigan, and other Northern States, which find that the Canadian who has decided to become an American makes a magnificent American citizen. There is a great community of interest on this unguarded border. I would hope that some reassurance could be voiced, as we approach a vote, to allay the fears of our Dominion neighbors.

First of all, let me say that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has been magnificent in working out the evolution of the bill through trying months of hearings. He was quick to respond to the basic concern of the Canadians. Initially, it had been the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Western Hemisphere ceiling be applicable to the numerical limitation on each nation in the Western Hemisphere. This would have been, indeed, a jolt to our Canadian neighbors. When I presented this problem to the Senator from North Carolina, he quickly responded—and prudently, I believe—by eliminating the 20,000 ceiling with respect to a national limitation in the Western Hemisphere.

This in itself should ease considerably the concern of our Dominion neighbors, but I believe that additionally I should make the point that I trust that the bill we are about to enact would not affect in any way the day-to-day exchange of visitors across our respective borders. Indeed, it would not affect the day-to-day entry of Canadians employed in this country. It applies only to those who would seek permanent residence and ultimate citizenship in the United States.

We shall have a thorough study made by the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration in the next 2 years. As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, I share the hope that that Commission will give proper consideration to the implications of a Western Hemisphere ceiling.

Finally, I believe that it would be useful for the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, some editorials and expressions of opinion from outstanding Dominion newspapers and the Canadian Embassy, which expressions are most temperate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN EMBASSY.

The Canadian Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State and has the honor to refer to the proposed changes in the U.S. immigration laws currently under consideration in the Congress.

The Canadian Government has followed with close attention the course of discussions on the proposed new legislation in the Congress. The intimate relationship and community of interest between the Governments and people of the United States and Canada have provided the basis for a unique degree of freedom of movement of citizens of the two countries across the international border in both directions. In keeping with the traditional lack of any numerical restriction on these movements, the Canadian Government has noted with satisfaction the strong stand taken by the administration to prevent the imposition of a ceiling of a kind which might change this situation.

It is, therefore, a matter of anxiety to Canadians that an amendment has been introduced in the Senate to limit immigration into the United States of America from the Western Hemisphere, including Canada. The adoption of such a measure by the U.S. Government would be a matter of serious concern to the Canadian Government. It would seem to place potential quantitative limitations on the movement of Canadians emigrating to the United States. It could cause particular uneasiness among persons living in border areas who may seek in future, as many have often done in the past, to take advantage of employment opportunities in neighboring parts of the other country.

It is, of course, the intention of the Canadian Government that Canadians should increasingly find full scope in Canada for the application of their talents and skills. The Canadian Government's concern is not only with the practical effect which the proposed measure might have on Canadians emigrating to the United States but also with the widespread anxiety and misunderstanding which it may cause. Moreover, the introduction of such a numerical limit would be regrettable in principle and could be regarded as setting an unfortunate precedent.

The Canadian Government finds it difficult to understand the need for a restriction of this nature and could only view it as a regressive development in the general relations between our two countries.

In the light of these considerations the Canadian Government hopes that the U.S. Government will continue to oppose strongly any proposals in the immigration legislation now under consideration in the Congress which might be regarded as having a restrictive effect on the movement of peoples between our two countries.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *September 3, 1965.*

[From the Toronto Globe & Mail, Aug. 31, 1965]

THE QUIET DIPLOMAT

The central theme of the Heeney-Merchant Report was that there should be free and easy consultation between the Governments of Canada and the United States before either became publicly committed to any one position, that it is in the interests of both countries that whenever possible divergent views be expressed and resolved in private through diplomatic channels. Mr. Arnold Heeney, coauthor of the report, enlarged upon this theme at Banff last week. But he had hardly finished his speech before President Lyndon B. Johnson knocked it flat. Mr. Johnson acted as if he had never heard of the Heeney-Merchant Report. In fact, by abruptly changing his administration's position on immigration from Canada and other Western Hemisphere countries, President Johnson embarrassed not only his own State Department, but left two Canadian Cabinet Ministers publicly contradicting each other. Perhaps without realizing that it was the President's go-ahead which made possible the vote by the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration to limit immigration from all countries in the Western Hemisphere to 120,000, External Affairs Minister Paul Martin said the move would be "a regressive factor in our traditional arrangements with United States insofar as the movements of our peoples are concerned." On the other hand, Mr. John R. Nicholson, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, welcomed the bill, figuring it would slow down the emigration of Canadians to the United States, now running at about 40,000 a year.

The bill is not likely to affect the Canadian migration to the United States very much, one way or another. No national quotas are being written into the bill, so that Canadians possessing the education, skills and training demanded of all immigrants should have little trouble competing with Latin Americans for the 120,000 annual openings. The point, however, is that President Johnson has taken action in the exceedingly sensitive field of immigration, solely on the dictates of domestic policy, and apparently without any prior consultation with Canada. It comes down to this: despite the well-intentioned recommendations of the Heeney-Merchant Report, the only quiet diplomacy is to be practiced by ourselves; the only consultation we may expect will be ex post facto.

[From the Montreal (Canada) Star, Aug. 28, 1965]

LARGELY IN THE MIND

If the proposed restriction on immigration into the United States to 120,000 annually from the Western Hemisphere becomes law, Canadians would be affected not entirely but mostly in their feelings. We are so used to going to the United States almost at will that the right to do so seems as if it were based on a law of nature. Natural law says that the people of the Western Hemisphere are all so nearly alike as makes no difference, and Canadian ideas of superiority are not relevant. Any other position amounts to discrimination, which we try to avoid in our own immigration regulations.

The practical effects of legislation on the point are difficult to forecast. They could be felt by several different classes of Canadians, those crossing the border daily to work in the United States, those crossing for periods of a few days at a time to work, those transferred by employers to plants in the United States for training, and those entering to take up permanent residence, sometimes to work,

sometimes to live in retirement where small incomes go further.

But a person entering and leaving the United States daily is not an immigrant. A seasonal worker goes in because his labor is needed, persons in line for transfer by industries big enough to do that sort of thing have influential sponsors, all considerations which would tend to limit the extent of changes in existing practices.

And quite apart from these aspects of the case, it appears that there is a general error in regard to the amount of Canadian emigration to the United States. It is said to be about 10,000 annually under present conditions, some of those persons who enter the United States by way of Canada not being Canadians at all but birds of passage.

Form requires our Government to make representations, but they will not have much content.

[From the Calgary (Alberta) Herald, Sept. 2, 1965]

U.S. IMMIGRATION CHANGES

The Minister of Immigration, Hon. J. R. Nicholson, is undoubtedly right in his assessment of U.S. plans which would limit immigration from Western Hemisphere countries, including Canada, to a total of 120,000 people a year.

It is, as Mr. Nicholson suggests, hard to see how the new legislation, which has been approved by a U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, can hurt this country.

Indeed, Canada may have suffered to some extent because it was so easy for Canadians to emigrate to the United States. The financial and other types of opportunities available in the United States have been a constant attraction for well-educated and highly skilled Canadians. The migration of this type of citizen to the United States has come to be regarded deploringly in this country as the "brain drain."

The restrictions contemplated in the United States do not seem likely to bar this type of Canadian in large numbers from U.S. citizenship. The proposed ceiling appears high enough to admit those with the highest qualifications. But, if it has the effect of encouraging at least some of the "brains" to remain and make the best of opportunities here, this country should benefit in the long run.

With these factors in mind, it is puzzling to detect an apparent difference of opinion within the Federal Cabinet on this question. Mr. Nicholson sees no harmful effects for Canada in the bill, but the External Affairs Minister, Hon. Paul Martin, regards it with misgivings.

[From the Sun (Vancouver, British Columbia), Aug. 28, 1965]

U.S. QUOTA—GOOD OR BAD?

It is understandable that there should be mixed reaction within the Canadian cabinet to the shape the U.S. new immigration policy is taking.

It comes as a shock to learn that for the first time—and with surprise approval from President Johnson—Canadian immigration to the United States may be put on a quota. This explains the affront obviously felt by External Affairs Minister Martin and his promise that representations against the proposed immigration bill will be made by Ottawa to Washington.

On the other hand we are told by Immigration Minister Nicholson that the quota "certainly would not hurt Canada." Mr. Nicholson's department has been working on a program to halt the Canadian brain-drain to the United States, so it hardly can be angry with Congress if the program is helped from that quarter.

Once we accept that in principle we would have no different status in connection with United States entry than other countries of the Western Hemisphere, we probably would find that little or nothing is changed in practice.

The United States will continue to admit all the Canadians it wants and needs according to their skills and education. Canada, if we are to believe the warnings of some most knowledgeable people, will continue to lose those citizens it needs the most.

Yet the brain-drain as a sap on the Canadian economy is not unchallenged.

A recent McGill study says the 1,000 to 1,500 Canadian professionals who emigrate south each year equal a dollar loss of $50 to $75 million—and that's just the cost of their training, not their possible contribution to our growth. Yet the Economic Council, balancing immigration of professionals against emigration, is confident that we come out on top.

But the Council does warn that, unless we expand efforts to attract and keep the best-trained people, the swap might not always remain favorable.

This, surely, is of larger Canadian concern than proposed U.S. immigration legislation theoretically relegating us to just another one of the crowd.

In this regard, MacMillan Bloedel's, J. V. Clyde has suggested such stay-at-home incentives to young professionals as special tax deductions; it's the take-home pay that isn't competitive, he says, not salaries.

And that sort of equalizer is something we cannot leave to the U.S. Congress.

[From the Toronto Daily Star, Aug. 30, 1965]

WHY U.S. BARRIERS TO CANADIAN EMIGRATION?

President Johnson may seriously damage Canadian-American relations by his surrender to Senate pressure for a quota system on Western Hemisphere people wishing to emigrate to the United States.

The President apparently has dismissed protests from Ottawa and from his own State Department in approving a Senate subcommittee amendment to an otherwise liberal immigration bill. The amendment would limit to 120,000 a year the number of people from Latin America and Canada who want to become U.S. citizens.

This is the first time any quota has been put on Western Hemisphere immigration and presumably reflects the fear among some Republican leaders that without such restrictions the United States, in time, will be flooded with immigrants from Latin America's exploding population.

Some 40,000 Canadians emigrate to the United States each year, their entry now subject only to financial responsibility and good moral character. Canada, in return, takes in about 11,000 Americans annually without any thought of limiting their numbers.

Why should Canadian emigrants to the United States be subject to quota restrictions that are not imposed on Americans coming here?

More important is the fact that a quota system will reduce the mobility of Canadians and Americans wishing to move between our two countries, a privilege—and a useful stimulation—that has existed since the founding of the two nations.

External Affairs Minister Paul Martin noted in Canada's protest to Washington that a quota system would be a "regressive factor" in arrangements between the two countries on the movements of their citizens.

It is unfortunate that his cabinet colleague, Immigration Minister Jack Nicholson, felt compelled to make the singularly asinine comment that he welcomed the restrictions because "we've been increasingly concerned with migration to the United States and my department had intended to take steps to reverse the flow."

Just what did Mr. Nicholson intend to do? Build a Berlin wall across 3,000 miles of undefended border?

Canada's so-called "brain drain" to the United States is more than compensated by the entry of talented immigrants to this country from overseas. And, in any case, the only way to keep Canadians from leaving is to make Canadian living and working conditions more attractive.

There is no doubt the Senate bill was aimed at Latin America and not at Canada but Ottawa cannot take any particular satisfaction from that. The fact is that on a first-come-first-served basis, the Western Hemisphere quota can be filled by Latin Americans before Canadians get to the border.

Canada cannot argue against restrictions from a high moral plane in light of our own immigration laws which discriminate on an economic basis. But we can ask that the quota section of the bill be removed and that restrictions be imposed no broader than our own—that is, immigrants must have skills that will contribute to the economy.

Because it removes previous racial barriers to American immigration, President Johnson's bill will be widely approved. But it will leave a bad taste if the price of Senate passage of the bill is the downgrading of those of us who live in the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. First, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his very gracious remarks concerning my activities in connection with the hearings and development of this bill.

The matter to which the Senator from Michigan has alluded illustrates, about as well as anything that has occurred, how this bill was fashioned. Personally, I am a great believer in the wisdom of the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act, and was opposed to its abolition. Frankly, I would still oppose its abolition if I had any hope of success. At the same time, I felt that there was a defect in the McCarran-Walter Act in that it provided no limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, I proposed a limitation upon immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, which, as the Senator from Michigan has so well stated, contemplated that countries of the Western Hemisphere would be placed under the same national limitation, in each case of 20,000, that the bill places upon the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere.

The Senator from Michigan called my attention very eloquently to the fact that Canada, our nearest neighbor to the north, was sending into this country in the neighborhood of 40,000 immigrants a year.

As a result of that fact, and his eloquent presentation of that fact, I did not press my proposal that, in addition to placing an overall limitation on all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, there should be a specific one of 20,000 for the people of each nation in the Western Hemisphere.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] did not favor any limitation of any kind at this time on the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has also

strongly expressed his disagreement with my amendment.

In order to devise a bill that would pass, these Senators, I think with great reluctance, have not pressed for the repeal of my amendment to place a 120,000 limitation upon the Western Hemisphere.

In deference to the eloquent presentation of the cause of Canada by the Senator from Michigan, I did not press my proposal that would place a limitation of 20,000 on each nation in the Western Hemisphere, in addition to the total Western hemispheric limitation of 120,000, plus families of American citizens.

As I stated to the Senate the other day, this bill represents the legislative process working in its very finest fashion. This bill is a composite bill, contributed to by many Senators on the subcommittee and the full committee.

If any one of us had written the bill by himself, he would have some changes in it. But we have a situation in which we have given and taken and adjusted our views in order to get a bill.

I honestly believe the bill in its present form as it went from the subcommittee to the full committee and as it has come from the full committee to the Senate is the very best bill obtainable at this time on this very emotional and crucial subject, the subject of immigration.

As I said the other day, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the minority leader, all of whom are now in the Chamber, and other members of the subcommittee and the full committee made most significant and substantial contributions to the presentation to the Senate of a bill which, as I said a moment ago, represents the very finest bill attainable at the present time on this subject.

Mr. HART. I appreciate very much the completely accurate description of the evolution of this bill given by the Senator from North Carolina, and all of us are grateful to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I should like to join my colleague the Senator from Michigan in the comments he has made about the words just spoken by the Senator from North Carolina. That is exactly the way the matter went. They are exactly the reasons, as referred to in the kind of references made by the Senator, for our restraint, notwithstanding our deep feelings on the subject.

I point out that not only Canada, but Mexico also is involved. Attorney General Katzenbach testified at page 16 of the House hearings that "70,000 of the 125,000 immigrants from the Western Hemisphere come from Canada and Mexico." The Senator from North Carolina had that fact in mind. Mexico sends into our country approximately 30,000 a year. It is a sensitive and important point to that country to the south of us.

I take this moment to express a plea to our neighbors in Latin America. We have not heard a great deal about this matter from Latin America. We may. Demagogs may seek to use what may result from the conference at a later time.

Let it be said, first, that there is no diminution of any kind or character in the highest rate of immigration from Latin America in recent years. The figure is now about 135,000. It has averaged at 110,000 per year for the past 10 years. As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] pointed out, the addition provided for brings the number beyond the current range, which in 1964 was about 140,000.

Second, we are engaged in a great immigration reform. I hope our friends in Latin America, whom we number in the millions, will understand they are helping us in achieving an important reform for America's position in the world. With all due respect to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in what he has said about the national origins quota system, it has been one of the most distasteful aspects of American foreign policy, so far as the nations of the world are concerned. Some persons may say, "What do we care what they think of us if we are right?" But, Mr. President, we are wrong. I hope the people of Latin America will understand this.

This is not a country-by-country limitation, I say to our friends in Latin America. It is a hemispheric limitation, because we consider the whole hemisphere as our partner.

Even with that limitation, we are providing for a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration composed of 15 members to study this matter in the Senate version of the bill so that if dictates of policy or other ideas are deemed necessary within the next few years, the Senate is opening the door wide to discussion and to considerations which may occur in that period of time and leaving the door open as to what may be dictated by the interests not only of this country, but of the hemisphere.

We cannot stop demagogs and people who are here to disturb the relationship of the American States, but at least we can set the record straight, that within the context of this new, and I think noble, immigration policy, we have tried in every way to accommodate the special relations, affection, and friendship which exist between the United States and the people of Latin America.

I have never heard the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] say that there has been any abuse of the immigration policy from the other American Republics or from Canada, but in accordance with his view, and that which has prevailed in the totality of the proposed new law, as we are approaching a new policy, let us make it a new policy across the board.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield, I concur in what the Senator from New York has said to the effect that there has been no abuse in immigration from any of the countries of the Americas.

I might also state that the first bill which proposed to place a limitation upon the nations of the Western Hemisphere was introduced by one of the Senator from New York's predecessors, Senator Herbert Lehman, in 1955. At that time he said:

> I say to those who criticize placing Western Hemisphere nations under the quota system—let's be fair to all. The same criteria should apply to all peoples, regardless of the place of their birth. I believe our Latin American neighbors will respect us for such a policy.

I sincerely trust that his belief will be justified.

Of the contributions made by Senators on the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee, some of them were contributions of omission as well as contributions of commission.

The Senator from New York deserves special praise on that point, because he was very much concerned about certain provisions of the naturalization law and certain provisions with respect to procedure in deportation cases; but he withheld amendments on those proposals because he was anxious to process a bill concerning the receipt of immigrants for permanent residence and eventual citizenship. I think his is one of the significant contributions made to this bill in that respect.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

There is a liberal provision with respect to refugees from Cuba, enabling them to regularize their status. That is an indication of the warm disposition of sympathy and favor of the United States toward other American states in the matter of immigration.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from New York for this exchange. It clarifies the matter, it ought to reassure the Nation that we recognize the seriousness of the steps we take.

We have created a commission which I hope will, without overwhelming pressure in time, report to us an objective evaluation on the desirability or undesirability of imposing a Western Hemisphere ceiling when 1968 arrives.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

ADDRESS OF MADAM CHIANG KAI-SHEK AT SENATE LUNCHEON

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate had the privilege today of attending a luncheon in the Senate Conference Room and to hear an address by Madam Chiang Kai-shek. She is, as everyone knows, a very intelligent and gracious lady. She gave

a rather brief address, but one that is thought provoking.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the address of Madam Chiang Kai-shek.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I remember with pleasure it was some 6 years ago that I had the honor of being invited by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to lunch and to meet its members. Today I am again so honored by my Senate hosts and friends, and the presence here of so many solons who have taken the time and trouble to greet me so cordially fills my heart with warm gratitude.

In the intervening 6 years since I was last here in the United States the world has not been uneventful as you ladies and gentlemen only know too well. But, fortunately, the Republic of China, thanks to your help, has remained the guardian rock in the Western Pacific standing watch in a tossing, churning, treacherous sea.

The years before 1958 were even more perilously eventful for the Republic of China and for all that it stands for; yet through it all you, our friends, have held on to the principles of freedom, of decency, and of morality.

Somehow in the correlation of thought and events my mind seemed to run effortlessly in focusing onto two trivia from introspective reflection of insignificant recollection, both seemingly of little import in themselves; yet they have shaped and will shape and test our manhood in the moment of truth. I give them to you here as I recall them.

Last Monday morning after laying a wreath on the tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington, and the strangely haunting notes of taps pervading the quiet vastness below brought to mind the inscription on a memorial in Kohima, Burma, erected to an ungainly, lonely, unprepossessing youth, Lance-Corporal John Harmon, who won posthumously the Victoria Cross in World War II. And these were the words:

"When you go home tell them of us and say
For your tomorrow we gave our today."

The other day whilst reading a newspaper, I came across a drawing done in charcoal showing a primitive grave with a rifle stuck into the mound by the bayonet mounted onto the barrel of the gun. And on top of the butt of the rifle was a GI's steel helmet tilted and slightly askew with the chin straps dangling loosely downward and flapping somewhat in the desolate wind, as if saying with silent eloquence, "Well, I have given my best, my all, my ultimate to this worthy cause." It took but a trice for anyone looking at the picture to know what the sketch was meant to convey. Yet should there be any hesitation as to its meaning, the caption: "Nowhere Does Freedom Come Cheap" dissipated any doubt once and for all.

Not having at all times a lazy mind, the little wheels in my head began to spin, and my memory raced back to the moments in history and events seeking to pick out one—just one instance where I could find an exception to those words in the caption "Nowhere Does Freedom Come Cheap."

Could an exception be found in some of the many epitaphs of struggles of yesteryear for freedom? Or perhaps in the tears and blood spilt during the French Revolution? Or in the strivings for representation and justifiable national identity in the American Revolution? And how about our own revolution in China with its attendant miseries, heartbreaks, and sacrifices leagued with undaunted grandeur of spirit?—to cite but a few instances. My mind refused to yield one single exception where freedom had been obtained cheaply; and I should be much obliged if someone—anyone—could give me one exception—just one exception—to this inexorable and frightening truth.

For some unexplainable reason, this truth, this thought which is nothing new, often regarded by the blase, the cynical, the deliberately biased and purposed as being trite and shopworn, has passed through my mind on innumerable occasions. Yet it never fails to leave a certain sadness upon my being. The stark reality is that neither wanting to wish it away, nor resorting to escapism, nor casuistry, nor groveling cowardice can buy freedom cheaply.

How poignantly sad, but true, are these words: From nowhere, but nowhere does freedom come cheap.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am deeply indebted to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator in charge of the pending bill, for making it possible for me to make some concluding remarks on it. I felt that perhaps there were some historic items that ought to be made a part of the record, because we shall hear more and more about our immigration problems in the light of the population expansion.

I have said on occasions that I doubted whether we would ever be able to draft another immigration bill without giving top consideration to the question of expanding populations all over the world.

For the moment, however, I should like to go back to set a little background for what is being contrived here today.

I support the bill. I supported it in the subcommittee. I supported it in the full committee. I shall vote affirmatively when the roll is called on it.

However, I invite attention to the fact that the problem of immigration goes back to the days of the American Revolution. One of the remonstrances that Thomas Jefferson wrote into the Declaration of Independence against King George III was that, among other things, he obstructed naturalization and discouraged migration from the Old World to the New World.

It was, in fact, on the very day of the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, that the Continental Congress passed a resolution covering into citizenship all persons who were in the Colonies.

In the Articles of Confederation, on the 2d of March 1781, it was declared that the "free inhabitants shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens." When, finally, the Articles of Confederation gave way to the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution, among other things, in its delegation of power to the legislative branch provided Congress with the power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." Naturalization, of course, connotes the very fact that people will be coming here from foreign shores. As a consequence, the problem was how to cover them into the citizenship of the country. That is a power that lies in the legislative branch and should be exercised when the occasion calls for it.

We lived with the problem of migrants and immigration even in the days of the War of 1812, because the British undertook to impress what they thought were British subjects from American vessels and take them back to England. Even in 1858, this practice prevailed, and President Buchanan had to send the American Navy into the Gulf of Mexico in order to stop it. It was not until 1870, when Queen Victoria was on the throne of Great Britain, that we finally managed to have an understanding and secure rights, whereby a British subject, if he so desired, could expatriate himself.

With citizenship and naturalization pretty well settled, we could expect greater immigration of people from other countries. It is rather interesting to take a look at the various forces that sent people here. Of course, some of them probably came with romantic notions as to what the new land offered; but there were other reasons besides that.

From 1770 to 1820, it is estimated that perhaps not more than 250,000 people came to this country, largely from Europe. It was estimated that in the year 1820 about 20,000 persons came to these shores.

Then came the Irish famine, with its hunger and misery; and it was thought that perhaps more relief could be obtained by coming to this land of freedom. Largely as a result of that famine—and that was in 1855—400,000 came to this country. We were not particularly immigration conscious at that time.

Beginning in 1871, there was a need for railroad workers, because America was in an expansionary mood. Labor was needed to work on the railroads that went to the Pacific and finally closed the frontier. In that year, we brought in 400,000 people. But in 1878 the number dropped back to 150,000.

In 1882 came a continuance of the Irish famine, together with the rise of militarism in Germany. These events accounted for the largest number of immigrants, and in that year 800,000 came to this country.

In 1898, when we were still in the tail end of the depression of 1893, which was probably the fifth or sixth major economic dislocation in this country, there came, even then, 200,000 immigrants. But a peak was reached in 1905, for in that year 1,250,000 people came from foreign shores.

When the depression struck after black Friday in 1929—and, as I recall, October 19 of that year was on a Friday, so it was not unlike the black Friday of 1873—people abroad knew full well the

difficulties that we were experiencing, and our immigration fell to about 40,000. The number has shuttled from that time on, generally in the area of 250,000 a year.

So we became immigration conscious, and Congress began to take note. In 1924, we heard the very first effort to develop the so-called national origins concept. In that year—and that was during the Coolidge administration—the so-called origins concept was offered on two different occasions in the House of Representatives and was defeated on both occasions. It remained for the Senate to take the initiative and to write that idea into an immigration act in that year. At first, it was felt that by using a factor of 2 percent based on the number of any given nationality in this country, as determined in the 1890 census, that would be a broad formula to determine the number that should come in from abroad. Since that time, the formula has been revised. Instead, the 1920 population census was used, and one-sixth of 1 percent has been used as the mathematical formula for determining the number of each nationality that should come to these shores.

At long last, an overall ceiling of roughly 157,000 was hit upon. It is rather strange how from that ceiling number, on a quota basis, a national origins concept was finally distributed. Eighty-two percent of that whole number came from Western and Northwestern Europe; 16 percent came from Southeastern Europe; and only 2 percent came from countries in the rest of the world.

So in 1952 we first heard about the McCarran-Walter Act.

I go back to 1933. In that year I came to Congress. After being frustrated and disappointed over committee assignments, having won in a year in which there was a presidential landslide, I thought that I should have first call on the leading committees in the House. Instead, I found myself assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia, to the Committee of Insular Affairs, and to the Committee on Immigration. I served a great many years on the Immigration Committee on the House of Representatives.

I recall so well the individual cases and the individual bills which were introduced every year in hardship cases, and other cases which were presented to Members of Congress in every corner of the country.

In 1952 there was an overall survey of the whole problem, and out of it came the McCarran-Walter Act. It laid down the so-called national origins concept and fixed the quotas. It repealed what was sex discrimination at that time in the existing law. It repealed the Oriental Exclusion Acts that were on the books.

Every country received a quota of at least 100. Then we dealt with the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle. That is an area in the Pacific that runs roughly from Pakistan to Japan, and then to the Polynesian Islands. Those were the intrusions on our immigration policy at that time.

One may well wonder how the McCarran-Walter Act actually worked. I believe that these figures are substantially correct, and they are yearly averages for the years from 1959 to 1963. By averages, for each of those 4 years, we received 98,000 quota immigrants. We received 180,000 nonquota immigrants.

There were an estimated 27,000 alien departures in each year. The net number of immigrants could be set at the figure of 250,000. That figure, of course, included the nonquota immigrants from this hemisphere. Generally speaking, they were divided about like this: 40,000 from Mexico, 32,000 from Canada, and 20,000 were accounted for mainly as being the wives of citizens of the United States who, as such, enjoyed a special preference.

The character of immigrants who came to our country in the period from 1952 to 1961 is, I suppose, of considerable interest, and probably will be, because of the preferential status which we have established in the pending bill.

The figures which I have show that in that 9-year period we received 8,600 who could be identified as skilled craftsmen. We received 14,000 doctors, 28,000 nurses, 12,000 technicians, 9,000 machinists, 4,900 chemists, 1,100 physicists, 30,000 engineers, and 7,000 tool and diemakers.

It has been a long time since an organized effort got underway to change the whole origins concept; and one can see the logic of it. In the first place, about 56 percent of the quota numbers were never used and, under existing law, they lapsed. They could not be transferred to another year in which all of the quota numbers had been used. That was one argument that could be well made.

Second, the smaller quotas were frightfully oversubscribed. In some cases, the number was oversubscribed by as many as 9 years. I believe that in one case it was oversubscribed to the extent of 90 years. In one case, if one were to file an application with an American consular office abroad, he could expect to wait 5 years before his application was reached; and at the other extreme, a person could expect to wait 90 years before his application would be processed.

There are still other problems and other factors. I remember cases arising out of my own experience in working on the problem of reuniting families.

A Member of this body who does not have a large metropolitan center in his State cannot quite realize how many immigration cases involving family hardship ultimately come to the attention of the Representatives and Senators; and they are tearful cases. Indeed, it would require almost the wisdom of a Solomon to undertake to solve some of the problems.

I mentioned to our policy committee on Tuesday a case that always entranced me. The master of a freighter steamship jumped ship, his own ship, in New York, mingled with the crowd, and finally found his way to Chicago. He eventually came to my hometown. Nobody paid too much attention to him. He was a very thrifty, able, frugal worker. He got himself a dinner bucket job in a factory and, by dint of sheer diligence and devotion to his job, he finally became one of the top foremen. In a short space of time, he was being invited to come to luncheon clubs and other organizations to give speeches.

Back in those days, or at about that time, I was a district commander in the American Legion, and the Legion post in that area used to invite this man to tell about his war experiences. He had a fabulous record.

This man addressed many of the luncheon clubs. Nobody ever worried about his identity. Nobody cared whether he had a social security number. We took him into the bosom of the municipal family.

One night there was a knock on my door and there he stood. When he came into my study and told me his story, here was a man with broad shoulders, a mature man, weeping like a baby.

His problem was that his wife and youngsters were still in the old country and he wanted to get them here. He said, "I will build a new house; I can pay for it in cash. I will buy the finest furniture; I can pay for it in cash. I want my family."

Mr. President, it took me over a year, sometimes by devious effort, to work it out. However, I was there the day that that family was reunited, and what a blessed thing it really was.

That is a single instance. I do not know how many hundreds—I was going to say thousands—of times that same kind of problem came to my attention. The subject has been before Congress for many years. That was perhaps another reason for re-evaluating the concept on which we work and the concept that we followed in respect of immigration bills.

There was a question of skill. A representative of one of the largest brewing companies in this country came to me and said, "We need an alemaker. We are going into the ale business." I said, "Why don't you go and get yourself one?" He replied "It is not that easy. We found one. He is in Czechoslovakia, but how can we get him here?"

We find that often labor organizations will go before the Immigration Board and resist an application on the ground that there ought to be alemakers among our own citizens.

They were in business. They knew the product that they had to brew to sell to the American people. They knew it required a topflight alemaker. It took some doing to get him here; but, Mr. President, I finally brought him over.

There we have an example of skills that we can use, that are identified in various corners of the world. But how to bring them here is quite a problem, unless we give them a preferential status.

Then there were the pressures from abroad. When, at long last, Sukarno finished with the Dutch in Indonesia, there were thousands of refugees, thousands of whom had to go back to Holland. In Holland, they have difficulty reclaiming land from the sea and holding back the sea so that it would not impregnate their soil and destroy its fertility. It is a little country. They can take care of only so many.

The Dutch Ambassador has been to see me several times, pleading, "Can't you

possibly do something so that we can get 10,000 of them into this country? For us, it is a burden to sustain them." That is another problem that we deal with when we face up to immigration policies and how to do equity in every case.

It is no secret that a good many people feel that southeastern Europe is the object and the victim of discrimination. When one looks at the one-sided quotas, one can readily come to that conclusion. For, under these various enactments in other years, 82 percent of the entire quota from northwestern Europe, only 16 percent from southeastern Europe, and 2 percent from the rest of the world, one can easily see the foundation for the charge that there has been discrimination.

Then there is the fact that we have been constantly patching our immigration laws. Over here sits a former distinguished Governor from Idaho. We were discussing the problem the other night.

I remember, Governor, if I may affectionately call you that, the fuss that we had about bringing Basque sheepherders to this country. I was delighted, the other night, to hear you tell the story about their frugality and assimilability into the population, and how they have graduated from sheepherding into profitable businesses in Idaho and some other Western States. They are among the best citizens there, as the Governor can so well testify. It was a job to bring them in, but it was a piece of patchwork we accomplished.

I remember the difficulty we had when we tried to patch up the law so far as orphans are concerned. Is there a heart that does not bleed for orphans? But bringing them in was quite another question. All of that had to be considered in the preparation of the bill.

Then, of course, there were the refugees. Anyone who has ever inspected refugee camps—and I have inspected them in the Levantine States like Lebanon and Syria, in Palestine, in India, and in Europe; I have seen Berlin virtually ringed with refugee camps, to the point where finally they become professional refugees.

That is not difficult to understand. When I said to the officials of Syria, "Why not issue these people work cards, so that they can go to work?" and obviously they could not without a work card. They said, "Our own labor is opposed to it." So, no work card, no work. No work, they fall back upon their refugee status. A second generation of professional refugees has not gotten out of some of the camps in various parts of the world. It is a problem that we cannot blink. In this bill, we provide for 10,200 refugees, but within the ceiling of 170,000 for all of the world except the Western Hemisphere.

I add to all this the individual relief bills that we were continually called upon to introduce. It should not have to be done. But it had to be done, and it takes time to process every one.

There are other factors that I think dictated the need for a new approach to the whole problem of immigration. There is one item in the bill that is my particular baby, and that is the Commission, three from the Senate, three from the House, and nine appointed by the President, to make a 3-year study, not only of immigration, but of the population explosion generally and its impact on employment and unemployment as well. That Commission is to make its first report on the 1st of July, 1967. That will be 1 year before the transition from our present system to the new system becomes entirely complete. The final report will be made on the 30th of June 1968, when the transition is completed.

I have given some attention to the problem; and it, too, is a problem we cannot blink. Down on Massachusetts Avenue there is a privately endowed population reference bureau which works in this field. The figures I have here, I have obtained from them. The world population will increase and is increasing now by the fantastic number of 65 million every year. Sixty-five million mortals are born into this world every year at one place or another. In Latin America—and these figures are obtained from the same source—the present population is about 200 million. By 1980—and that is only 15 years away—it is estimated that the figure will be 374 million.

What will they do? They will be beating upon the doors of this country. Under a nonquota system, so long as they can satisfy consular officers that they can sustain themselves, and that they will not become public charges, they can come into this country.

I presume, as a rounded figure, that we can say that 120,000 come in as nonquota immigrants from the Western Hemisphere every year. In the bill we have set a ceiling of 120,000.

I do not believe our Canadian neighbors will become too excited, because, insofar as I know, they would prefer to keep their people at home instead of having them migrate to the United States for residence purposes.

I doubt whether we shall have any difficulty so far as the adjoining Republic of Mexico is concerned. We get at the present time, I believe, about 40,000 from Canada and about 32,000 from Mexico.

Then there is the figure of, roughly, 20,000 spouses and perhaps children of those who are already legally in this country.

In the bill, there is a quota of 120,000 for the Western Hemisphere. The origins concept is repealed. Going back to consider how it was devised, I presume it served a purpose in its time, for want of something better. However, I am sure it is an outmoded system today, and cannot well be logically sustained.

We have repealed the so-called Asian-Pacific triangle. It is estimated that when we total up the score, there may be an additional 50,000 or 60,000 people who will come into this country over the averages that we have had before.

I puzzled about it. I have received telephone calls and letters, scolding, and resisting the idea, and urging me not to support the pending bill.

A few years back, we passed a bill which had the rather sweet title of "The Fair Share Act." In this modern world, I fancy we must make allowances for our fair share. As population crowds in other countries, we can scold, we can say, "Go down to Brazil, to that vast area." Some of it is primitive, and I have flown over most of it, but the Brazilians are likely to say, "You do your share and we will do ours."

We might then say, "Go to the Argentine. There is a great deal of space there." They are likely to say, "You do your share and we will do ours."

It is in that spirit that we must approach the pending bill today; and I believe that that idea was constantly in the minds of the members of the committee in undertaking to put the final touches on the measure. It is a workmanlike job. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] deserves generous praise for the diligence with which he has pursued this matter, the long hours and the hard work which he has devoted to it.

For a time, it appeared that perhaps we might have difficulty ever getting a bill. There were many differences concerning it. I remember a significant meeting in my office at which three persons were present—I shall not name them; but, I will say that after we got through we had a fair understanding, and with that understanding the bill began to move. So it is on the floor of the Senate today for consideration.

Now, Mr. President, a word about some of the opposition's argument, some of the criticism—and the appropriate answers.

It has been alleged that we shall be flooding the labor market of the country. In the first place, there is a 170,000 world ceiling, and a 120,000 Western Hemisphere ceiling. In addition, if a person wishes to come into this country only for the purpose of getting a job, he not only requires consular clearance, but also clearance by the Secretary of Labor as labor.

It has been said that we shall be opening up the gates to a vast flood from some particular country. That is the reason the pending bill contains a ceiling of 20,000 from any 1 country—no more.

It has been said that we are opening up the floodgates generally. All I can do is point to the ceilings which have been imposed and invite attention to the fact that the additions over the ceilings are based essentially upon reunification of families.

It has been said that we shall get a great number of undesirables. None of the screening process which has been carried in existing law has been forfeited in the pending bill. Applicants still have to be screened. There is still power in American consular offices in every part of the world to look a person over, to look his application over, and to determine whether he fits within the frame of the pending bill and would be a desirable addition to this free land of ours.

It has been said that we might encourage so-called ship-jumping or crew drop-offs. Of course, there is a provision in the pending bill under which bond can be required in order to hold that to a minimum.

It has been said that unless we do something about the Western Hemisphere, we may be inundated. The 120,000 ceiling is there.

I believe that we should pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who was the author of that ceiling and who insisted upon it—and I insisted along with him; because as our population expands I can foresee what the problem will be, not in the remote future, but in the near future.

Thus, that is a protection. I know of nothing else that we can write into the bill in order to satisfy those who might have been critical or who are opposed to the bill; but, I have said on occasion to some Members who have not been confronted with these problems of family reunification, and skills, that if they had a metropolitan center in their State they would soon find out what it means, and the many cases which would come across their desks in the course of a year.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. In the course of the interesting colloquy just had with the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from North Carolina, and myself, it was said that we wished to make it clear—and all of us join in this—to our friends and brothers in all of the Americas, Canada, Mexico, and the other American states, that this bill represents an effort to do something globally for the immigration policy of the United States which, to many of us, has been so unsatisfactory that we are proceeding to reform this across the board. We have tried to do this within the confines of the pending bill. It represents a contribution to the totality of a great and constructive reform in American immigration policy.

The greatest solicitude has been shown in many parts of the bill, in the regularization of the status of Cuban refugees, and in other ways to show that we propose to continue this special relationship, this solidarity, with the people of all the Americas.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] was gracious enough to join in that, and I address the same suggestion to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I could point out, in addition, that since this transition does not become complete until July 1, 1968, we still have room for maneuvering. Obviously, when we provide for an arbitrary ceiling, we cannot expect everyone to like it, we cannot expect other countries and their officials, particularly, to like it; but this will be an opportunity to make a try and see what we can accomplish. In that 3-year period, we may have to make some modifications, but we will then have better figures at hand, and if modifications are required, they can be made.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator from Illinois also join us—and I shall detain the Senate for only 30 seconds more—in the statement that we do not feel that Latin America has abused the unrestricted immigration privilege, that the pending bill is not the result of any such feeling, but rather the feeling of the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from North Carolina, and other Senators, as regards international policy; that we should reform our immigration policy across the board.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator pointed up the population explosion in this hemisphere with some dramatic figures.

I do not wish anything placed in the bill which would affect our relationships with our friendly neighbors in this hemisphere, but I approve of the Ervin amendment, or something along that line. I believe that it is much easier, in view of the figures the Senator has submitted, that we do something now, than that we should be forced to do something 5 years from now, and the Secretary of State and the President at that time are forced to place into law a policy which would then be really a curtailing policy, whereas this is more of a limiting policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. We have in mind, of course, those who see our own population growth and who become concerned about the impact of migration from abroad on the labor market of this country. We have not been insensitive of that fact. So out of this same reference bureau—and I think I may as well put the full name in the RECORD; it is the Population Reference Bureau, Inc., 1755 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.—we get some very interesting figures.

Our population today is growing at the rate of 7,200 every 24 hours. If that rate continues, it will take only 700 days to accumulate a 5-million increase.

Those people are experts in their field, because they have been so bold as to forecast that in the month of May 1967, our population will reach 200 million.

So while other countries grow, our country grows, too. That is another factor to be kept in mind. We do not want to be arbitrary, but we want to meet every challenge, every consideration, every problem as we may conceive it. Who knows what modifications will have to be made in other days? If they are to be made, I am sure the Congress will be willing to make them.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am sure Congress will do that. My point was that it is easier to do it today in the bill than, in view of the figures to which the Senator has referred, as well as other figures which are available, to do it 5 or 6 or 7 years from now. We can always modify, but it seems to me the time has come to do something today, which is not restrictive today, but which would prevent us from having to do something that might be catastrophic in the future.

We are to have a sugar bill, which is being considered by the Finance Committee, next week, if the other body should dispose of it. I have received numerous calls from those who represent sugar interests in other countries with reference to the bill. I have had no inquiries with respect to the Ervin proposal. Perhaps there could be a difference of 10,000 or 20,000 in the figure, but if the good Lord and the people of Kentucky permit me to be in this body, say, 10 years from now, and there were a need to place restrictions in immigration at that time, I am sure we would have many calls.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point the Senator makes is so proximate to the problem before us now. Representatives of a country from South Africa were in my office only 2 weeks ago. I said, "You are far away from home. Why are you interested in getting a bigger share of the sugar quota?" I was told, "For the reason that we have heavy unemployment, and we think an expansion of our quota is the only thing we can do to provide some jobs to relieve the growth pressure." So the question before us is a fabric of many dimensions.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. With respect to the discussion about hemispheric restrictions, which was referred to in the dialog between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Kentucky, the provisions which were considered in the House did provide some restrictions on the Western Hemisphere. The House bill which was considered and acted upon provided a sort of sliding ceiling, so that in any one year the number coming from the Western Hemisphere could not exceed the mean of the preceding 5 years by 10 percent without causing the President to report to Congress.

The labor provisions were also tightened with relation to those who sought to come into this country and enter the labor ranks.

For the record, those of us who had serious reservations in accepting the restriction of 120,000, exclusive of immediate family relationships, felt that the provisions included in the House bill were sufficiently restrictive to take into consideration the growth of population in the Latin American countries or any other factors related to hemispheric immigration.

I wanted the record to be clear, at this point in the dialog, for the benefit of Senators who may still have reservations about the ceilings, that we are on firm ground and we do not believe this measure will open unlimited immigration to this country from the Western Hemisphere or anywhere else.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on that point, I did not mean to imply that what was done was absolutely correct or proper. I, too, have reservations about the way we are approaching the problem. I am not unsympathetic toward the position the Senator has expressed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator has rather consistently on all occasions embraced the idea he has just expressed. Others of us like myself felt that there ought to be an unequivocal provision in the law, and it ought to be an ascertained figure. I like that approach infinitely better, and

that is why I joined the Senator from North Carolina with respect to the provision he wanted to have inserted in the bill. I think it is a good ceiling and that we should try it. We are flexible enough to be able to deal with it in the days ahead.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a rather interesting publication of the Population Reference Bureau called "Population Profile."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION PROFILE

In 165 years the daily U.S. population increase has grown 16 times: About 1800, daily increase 450; mid-1965 daily increase 7,200.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE MILLION AMERICANS

Anyone contemplating a big celebration for the day when the U.S. population reaches 200 million should start planning fairly soon. According to the Population Reference Bureau, there are only about 21 months to go.

The 195-million mark is expected to be reached in late August of this year. At the present rate of growth the next 5 million needed to top 200 million would be added around May 1967.

Currently, U.S. population is growing by about 7,200 a day, requiring some 700 days to accumulate a 5-million increase. The first U.S. Census in 1790 enumerated 3.9 million persons. For two decades thereafter the Nation's growth averaged only about 450 persons a day, requiring 30 years to add 5 million. The U.S. birth rate around 1790 was more than twice as high as it is now. However, today's larger population base of 195 million can roll up a 5-million increase much faster than a base of 3.9 million.

BIGGER, NOT BETTER

Once a country's population passes the 100-million mark, even a moderate fertility rate produces a sizable numerical increase. India's population, for example, is increasing by 5 million every 150 days. If India suddenly cut both her birth rate and death rate in half, making them roughly equal to the U.S. rates (21.2 births and 9.4 deaths per 1,000 population), her population would still increase at well over 5 million a year. This is what comes of having a population of nearly half a billion. If population growth in the United States continues at the present rate, in just over 60 years this Nation will have as many people as India has today.

Japan, to take another example, has cut her birth rate to among the lowest in the world, 17.2. With a population just under 100 million, Japan will still realize a 5-million increase in 5½ years. In Canada, on the other hand, where the population is less than 20 million, it would take over 10 years at the current rate of growth to reach a total of 25 million.

MORE PEOPLE, LOWER BIRTH RATE

Around 1800, when the U.S. birth rate was over 50, the annual population increase was about 165,000. Today, with a moderate birth rate of 21.2, the increase is over 2.6 million each year.

The uncertainty of the family-size preferences of upcoming parents makes the future of U.S. population growth difficult to predict. During the post-World War II baby boom, the U.S. birth rate reached 26.6 in 1947—the highest since 1921. Although the rate has declined somewhat in recent years, the population gain for the intercensal decade (1950–60) was an unprecedented 28 million—almost identical to the 28.5-million increase for the 20-year period, 1930–50.

While the U.S. birth rate has gone down since 1957 and shows no signs of leveling off, the rising tide of young women just entering the high-fertility age group, 20 to 29, is expected to make an impression on the total fertility of the Nation.

"The 195-million mark in August may become a turning point in U.S. population growth," according to Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau.

In view of the very large fertility potential which now confronts us, the decades immediately ahead must be viewed as crucial ones," said Cook. "Even with a leveling off of the birth rate, we will be adding nearly 3 million a year to our population. If present trends continue, we will reach a growth level of 5 million a year during the last decades of the century." The highest projection of the Bureau of the Census, based on a return to the high-fertility rates of the postwar years, shows the U.S. population increasing by 7.5 million per year between 2000 and 2010.

SHIFTING AGE STRUCTURE

At present, American parents of a newborn baby can expect their child to live past the age of 70. In 1900, life expectancy at birth was less than 50 years. The U.S. population aged 65 and over has increased by almost 500 percent since 1900, from 3 million to nearly 18 million. The number of children under 19 has risen from 34 million in 1900 to 77 million today.

The median age of the population is now 28.5 years and could drop to 25 years if U.S. fertility reverts to the postwar pattern. Thus, over half the population is in the dependent age groups of under 19 and over 65.

"Urban concentration is adding to the problems created by this socially demanding age structure," Cook said. "Over 70 percent of all Americans live in cities. Already we are nationally distraught by the perplexing problems of urban congestion, water shortage, juvenile crime, chronic deficiency in educational facilities, and inadequate care of the aged.

"Those who think growth to 195 million Americans should be celebrated with noisemakers and paper hats might well prepare their children to celebrate the 400-million mark with padlocked personal water bottles and oxygen masks."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table giving a summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued for the fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued, fiscal year 1964*

[Nonimmigrant visas by country of nationality; quota immigrant visas by country or area of quota or subquota chargeability; nonquota visas by country or area of birth or presumed quota chargeability]

Country	Annual quota	Immigrant visas				Nonimmigrant visas			Total, immigrant and nonimmigrant
		Quota	Nonquota	Special nonquota symbol K	Total, immigrant	Issued	Revalidated	Total, nonimmigrant	
Europe:									
Albania	100	95	6	1	102	17		17	119
Andorra	100					2		2	2
Austria	1,405	1,299	265	2	1,566	7,630	883	8,513	10,079
Belgium	1,297	981	54	2	1,037	8,499	765	9,264	10,301
Bulgaria	100	86	26		112	300	7	307	419
Czechoslovakia	2,859	1,876	87	31	1,994	2,363	55	2,418	4,412
Danzig, Free City of	100	92	34		126				126
Denmark:									
Government country		1,147	224		1,371	8,225	1,022	9,247	10,618
Greenland									
Denmark, total	1,175	1,147	224		1,371	8,225	1,022	9,247	10,618
Estonia	115	102	12		114	62	85	147	261
Finland	566	536	105		641	4,487	309	4,796	5,437
France:									
Governing country		2,713	1,471	5	4,189	42,821	3,771	36,592	50,781
Algeria		2	3		5				5
French Guiana		3			3				3
Guadeloupe		98	1		99				99
Martinique		46			46				46
Reunion		1			1				1
Comoro Islands									
French Polynesia		2	4		6				6
French Somaliland		1			1				1
French Southern Island									
New Caledonia		4			4				4
St. Pierre and Miquelon									
New Hebrides									
France, total	3,069	2,870	1,479	5	4,354	42,821	3,771	46,592	50,946
Germany	25,814	23,751	4,932	8	28,691	69,459	7,646	77,105	105,796

TABLE 1.—*Summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

[Nonimmigrant visas by country of nationality; quota immigrant visas by country or area of quota or subquota chargeability; nonquota visas by country or area of birth or presumed quota chargeability]

Country	Annual quota	Immigrant visas				Nonimmigrant visas			Total, immigrant and nonimmigrant
		Quota	Nonquota	Special nonquota symbol K	Total, immigrant	Issued	Revalidated	Total, nonimmigrant	
Europe—Continued									
Great Britain and Northern Ireland:									
Governing country		29,444	865	15	30,324	131,628	10,797	142,425	172,749
Aden		31			31				31
Antigua		100	68	4	172				172
Bahamas		100	128	2	230				230
Barbados		100	259	13	372				372
Basutoland									
Bechuanaland									
Bermuda		100	5		105				105
British Guiana		67	60	28	155				155
British Honduras		61	81	3	145				145
British Solomon Islands									
British Virgin Islands		100	51	1	152				152
Brunei									
Cayman Island		100	20	5	125				125
Dominica		99	3		102				102
Falkland Islands		1			1				1
Fiji		4	6		10				10
Gambia		1			1				1
Gibraltar		17			17				17
Gilbert Islands									
Grenada		100	36		136				136
Hong Kong		99	9		108				108
Kenya		25	2		27				27
Maldive Islands		1			1				1
Malta		98	125	8	231				231
Mauritius		14	2		16				16
Montserrat		99	9		108				108
North Borneo		1			1				1
North Rhodesia		55			55				55
Nyasaland		4	2		6				6
Pitcairn Island									
St. Christopher-Nevis		100	56		156				156
St. Helena		2			2				2
St. Lucia		100	8		108				108
St. Vincent		100	23		123				123
Sarawak									
Seychelles		3	1		4				4
Singapore		18	3		21				21
Southern Rhodesia		94	9		103				103
Swaziland									
Tonga		2			2				2
Turks Island		20	2	3	25				25
Uganda		2			2				2
Zanzibar		3			3				3
Great Britain and Northern Ireland, total	65,361	31,265	1,833	82	33,180	131,628	10,797	142,425	175,605
Greece	308	224	1,858	320	2,402	9,661	1,183	10,844	13,246
Hungary	865	711	228	56	995	4,746	314	5,060	6,055
Iceland	100	85	77		162	827	108	935	1,097
Ireland	17,756	6,256	72		6,328	7,973	334	8,307	14,635
Italy	5,666	5,390	4,217	1,612	11,219	37,299	6,085	43,384	54,603
Latvia	235	215	32	5	252	36	48	84	336
Liechtenstein	100	11			11	20		20	31
Lithuania	384	343	44	5	392	48	24	72	464
Luxembourg	100	87	6		93	452	25	477	570
Monaco	100	10	1		11	14	4	18	29
Netherlands:									
Governing country		2,836	313		3,149	21,834	3,610	25,444	28,593
Netherlands, New Guinea									
Netherlands Antilles		99	56	1	156				156
Surinam		81	10		91				91
Netherlands, total	3,136	3,016	379	1	3,396	21,834	3,610	25,444	28,840
Norway	2,364	2,170	53		2,223	10,985	590	11,575	13,798
Poland	6,488	6,170	1,008	57	7,235	3,230	118	3,348	10,583
Portugal:									
Governing country		373	1,025	317	1,715	4,814	552	5,366	7,081
Angola		1	1		2				2
Cape Verde Islands		19	23		42				42
Guinea, Portuguese									
India, Portuguese		1			1				1
Macao		1	1		2				2
Mozambique		1	1		2				2
Principe and Sao Tome									
Timor									
Portugal, total	438	396	1,051	417	1,764	4,814	552	5,366	7,130
Rumania	289	200	136	71	407	641	16	657	1,064
San Marino	100	100	6		106	23		23	129
Spain:									
Governing country		159	1,469	72	1,700	12,565	1,670	14,235	15,935
Fernando Po									
Ifni									
Rio Muni									
Spanish Sahara									
Spain, total	250	159	1,469	72	1,700	12,565	1,670	14,235	15,935
Sweden	3,295	2,165	72		2,237	14,575	897	15,472	17,709
Switzerland	1,698	1,610	128	1	1,739	12,444	927	13,371	15,110
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2,697	2,590	102	11	2,703	1,906	17	1,923	4,626
Yugoslavia	942	724	348	36	1,108	2,945	379	3,324	4,432
Europe, total	149,372	96,732	20,344	2,695	119,771	422,531	42,241	464,772	584,543

TABLE 1.—*Summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

[Nonimmigrant visas by country of nationality; quota immigrant visas by country or area of quota or subquota chargeability; nonquota visas by country or area of birth or presumed quota chargeability]

Country	Annual quota	Immigrant visas				Nonimmigrant visas			Total, immigrant and nonimmigrant
		Quota	Nonquota	Special nonquota symbol K	Total, immigrant	Issued	Revalidated	Total, nonimmigrant	
Asia:									
Afghanistan	100	29			29	289	7	296	325
Arab Peninsula	100	15	1		16	82	1	83	99
Asia Pacific	100	86	575		661				661
Bhutan	100								
Burma	100	86	5		91	205	21	226	317
Cambodia	100	3	5		8	170	12	182	190
Ceylon	100	87	10		97	329	45	374	471
China	100	79	170	23	272	8,225	594	8,819	9,091
Chinese persons	105		2,177	197	2,374				2,374
Cyprus	100	88	50	4	142	268	9	277	419
India	100	51	102	41	194	9,703	1,728	11,431	11,625
Indonesia	150	127	71	19	217	2,382	156	2,538	2,755
Iran	100	46	83	32	161	5,846	460	6,306	6,467
Iraq	100	44	55	53	152	1,338	208	1,546	1,698
Israel	100	42	142	23	207	14,848	870	15,718	15,925
Japan	185	101	3,159	65	3,325	39,299	891	40,190	43,515
Jordan	100	87	195	55	337	873	20	893	1,230
Korea	100	37	2,166	44	2,247	4,660	236	4,896	7,143
Kuwait	100	6			6	247	21	268	274
Laos	100	7			7	224		224	231
Lebanon	100	56	135	20	211	2,740	915	3,655	3,866
Malaya	50	15	3		18	302	6	308	326
Malaysia	200	29	18		47	675	19	694	741
Muscat and Oman	100					3	1	4	4
Nepal	100	3			3	122	13	135	138
Pakistan	100	45	26	8	79	2,830	69	2,899	2,978
Palestine	100	71	32		103	14	4	18	121
Philippines	100	36	2,378	193	2,607	12,828	2,140	14,968	17,575
Saudi Arabia	100	9	1		10	754	22	776	786
Syria	100	69	49	3	121	865	126	991	1,112
Thailand	100	85	54		139	2,468	19	2,487	2,626
Turkey	225	87	159	184	430	2,843	249	3,092	3,522
Vietnam	100	47	143		192	2,192	34	2,226	2,416
Yemen	100	92	2		94	33	4	37	131
Asia, total	3,715	1,665	11,966	964	14,595	117,657	8,900	126,557	141,152
Africa:									
Algeria	287	78	8		86	76		76	162
Burundi	100					2		2	2
Cameroon	151	2			2	122	8	130	132
Central African Republic	100					18	3	21	21
Chad	100					28	2	30	30
Congo	100	1			1	37		37	38
Congo, Republic of the	100	28	2		30	253	21	274	304
Dahomey	100					51	4	55	55
Ethiopia	100	78	3		81	480	49	529	610
Gabon	100					39	38	77	77
Ghana	100	58	4		62	478	57	535	597
Guinea	100		1		1	183	13	196	197
Ivory Coast	100	2			2	100		100	102
Kenya	20	10	1		11	314	23	337	348
Liberia	100	39	3		42	482	63	545	587
Libya	100	93	16		109	217	5	222	331
Malagasy Republic	100	4	1		5	103	3	106	111
Mali	100					63	2	65	65
Mauritania	100					34		34	34
Morocco	100	66	113	2	181	714	47	761	942
Niger	100	1			1	62	13	75	76
Nigeria	149	85			85	3,120	83	3,203	3,288
Rwanda	100					15	1	16	16
Senegal	100	6			6	97	7	104	110
Sierra Leone	100	13	1		14	305	35	340	354
Somali Republic	100	4	1		5	104	11	115	120
South Africa	100	57	69		126	4,438	553	4,991	5,117
South-West Africa	100	9	21	5	35	15	11	26	61
Sudan	100	75	1		76	317	22	339	425
Tanganyika	100	40			40	233	2	235	275
Togo	100	1			1	75	8	83	84
Tunisia	100	90	14	3	107	285	14	299	406
Uganda	50	4			4	109	5	114	118
United Arab Republic	100	47	74	22	143	2,393	636	3,029	3,172
Upper Volta	100					24	2	26	26
Africa, total	3,657	891	333	32	1,256	15,386	1,741	17,127	18,383
North America:									
Canada			38,604		38,604	747	69	816	39,420
Costa Rica			2,690		2,690	4,574	115	4,689	7,379
Cuba			16,088		16,088	2,033	545	2,578	18,666
Dominican Republic			7,206		7,206	23,828	2,118	25,946	33,152
El Salvador			1,345		1,345	4,524	115	4,639	5,984
Guatemala			619		619	5,817	1,744	7,561	8,180
Haiti			2,155		2,155	3,562	500	4,062	6,217
Honduras			1,815		1,815	3,652	238	3,890	5,705
Jamaica	100	90	1,393	153	1,636	13,489	653	14,142	15,778
Mexico			31,324		31,324	124,436	82,392	206,828	238,152
Nicaragua			1,100		1,100	3,674	412	4,086	5,186
Panama			1,835		1,835	3,226	480	3,706	5,541
Trinidad and Tobago	100	100	238	20	358	4,926	528	5,454	5,812
North America, total	200	190	106,412	173	106,775	198,488	89,909	288,397	395,172
South America:									
Argentina			6,404		6,404	16,904	558	17,462	23,866
Bolivia			780		780	1,837	98	1,935	2,715
Brazil			2,276		2,276	13,443	1,598	15,041	17,317
Chile			1,231		1,231	6,375	418	6,793	8,024
Colombia			10,090		10,090	21,053	1,610	22,663	32,753

TABLE 1.—*Summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

[Nonimmigrant visas by country of nationality; quota immigrant visas by country or area of quota or subquota chargeability; nonquota visas by country or area of birth or presumed quota chargeability]

Country	Annual quota	Immigrant visas				Nonimmigrant visas			Total, immigrant and nonimmigrant
		Quota	Nonquota	Special nonquota symbol K	Total, immigrant	Issued	Revalidated	Total, nonimmigrant	
South America—Continued									
Ecuador			3,600		3,600	6,234	349	6,583	10,183
Paraguay			203		203	639	67	706	909
Peru			2,195		2,195	10,841	1,580	12,421	14,616
Uruguay			316		316	2,416	111	2,527	2,843
Venezuela			897		897	20,095	9,674	29,769	30,666
South America, total			27,992		27,992	99,837	16,063	115,900	143,892
Oceania:									
Australia:									
Governing country		51	228	4	283	19,523	1,623	21,146	21,429
Christmas Island									
Cocos Island									
Papua, Territory of									
Australia, total	100	51	228	4	283	19,523	1,623	21,146	21,429
New Guinea	100					1		1	1
New Zealand:									
Governing country		76	117		193	6,600	386	6,986	7,179
Cook Islands									
New Zealand, total	100	76	117		193	6,600	386	6,986	7,179
Pacific Islands	100	69	42		111	242		242	353
Western Samoa	100	53	1		54	194	3	197	251
Nauru	100								
Oceania, total	600	249	388	4	641	26,560	2,012	28,572	29,213
No nationality						4,194	1,108	5,302	5,302
Grand total	157,544	99,727	167,435	3,868	271,030	884,653	161,974	1,046,627	1,317,657

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, those are the latest data I have seen on that subject.

Finally, Mr. President, from the same source, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table entitled "Population Information for 129 Countries," broken down to show increases, decreases, and so forth.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

World population data sheet [1]—*Population information for 129 countries*

Continent and country	Population estimates mid-1964 (millions)	Annual rate of increase since 1958 (percent)	Birth rate per 1,000 population (latest [2])	Death rate per 1,000 population (latest [2])	Population projections 1980 (millions [3])
Africa:					
Northern Africa			(45)	(22)	
Algeria	12.0	2.1	45–49		19.5
Ethiopia	21.0				29.0
Libya	1.3	1.9			1.9
Morocco	13.1	3.0			22.4
Somalia	2.3				2.9
Sudan	13.2	2.8	50–56		19.3
Tunisia	4.7	1.4	45–49	25–27	6.5
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	28.7	2.6	40–44	22–24	46.8
Tropical and southern Africa			(47)	(24)	
Angola [4]	5.1	2.1			6.0
Burundi	2.7				4.2
Cameroon	4.6	1.9	36–44	24–30	5.4
Central African Republic	1.3	1.9	39–47	26–32	1.6
Chad	2.8	1.1	44–52	25–31	3.8
Congo (Brazzaville)	.9	1.3			1.1
Congo (Léopoldville)	15.4	2.4	40–46		21.5
Dahomey	2.3	2.3	45–53	20–26	3.0
Gabon	.5	2.1			.5
Ghana	7.5	2.7	48–54		12.3
Guinea	3.5	3.0	53–57	33–35	5.0
Ivory Coast	3.7	2.2	49–55	33–37	5.0
Kenya	9.1	2.9	46–54		13.6
Liberia	1.0				1.2
Madagascar	6.1	2.8	43–49	17–21	7.6
Malawi [5]	3.8	2.1			6.1
Mali	4.5	2.1	55–63	26–32	6.4
Mauritania	1.0				
Mauritius [4]	.7	3.1	39.9	9.7	1.1
Mozambique [4]	6.9	2.0			91.0
Niger	3.2	3.0	49–57	24–30	4.5
Nigeria	56.0		45–53		91.0
Rwanda	2.9	2.6			3.5
Senegal	3.5	2.7	39–47	23–29	4.4
Sierra Leone	2.2				3.7
South Africa	17.5	2.6			26.8
Southern Rhodesia [4]	4.1	3.3			7.1
Tanzania [6]	10.3	1.9	46–50		14.4
Togo	1.6	2.6	51–59	26–32	2.3
Uganda	7.2	2.5	46–50		10.0
Upper Volta	4.8	3.3	43–49	27–31	6.3
Zambia [7]	3.6	2.8			5.7

Continent and country	Population estimates mid-1964 (millions)	Annual rate of increase since 1958 (percent)	Birth rate per 1,000 population (latest [2])	Death rate per 1,000 population (latest [2])	Population projections 1980 (millions [3])
Asia:					
Southwest Asia			(47)	(24)	
Cyprus	.6	1.0	24–28		.7
Iran	22.6	1.9	42–48	23–27	33.1
Iraq	7.0	1.8	47–51		13.8
Israel	2.5	3.5	24.6	6.2	3.1
Jordan	1.9	2.3	43–47		3.4
Kuwait	.3		37–43		.3
Lebanon	1.8				3.1
Saudi Arabia	6.6				9.4
Syria	5.4	3.2			9.3
Turkey	30.8	2.6	44–48		48.5
Yemen	5.0				6.9
South-central Asia			(43)	(21)	
Afghanistan	14.9		45–53		22.1
Bhutan	.7				1.0
Ceylon	10.9	2.7	35.8	8.5	18.3
India	468.5	2.3	39–43	21–23	661.5
Nepal	9.9	1.6	46–54	34–40	14.1
Pakistan	100.7	2.1	43–46	16–17	153.6
Southeast Asia			(49)	(23)	
Burma	24.2	2.1	47–53	33–37	35.0
Cambodia	5.9		47–53		9.8
Indonesia	102.2	2.2	40–46	19–23	152.8
Laos	2.0	2.5			2.9
Malaysia	10.9	3.3	40.9	8.6	18.1
Philippines	31.2	3.2	44–48		55.8
Thailand	29.7	3.0	40–44	19–21	47.5
Vietnam, North	17.8	3.4			24.5
Vietnam, South	15.9	3.7	40–48		21.9
East Asia			(42)	(19)	
China (mainland)	690.0	2.1			840.0
China (Taiwan)	12.1	3.6	36.3	6.1	17.2
Hong Kong [4]	3.8	4.5	32.1	5.5	5.5
Japan	96.8	.9	17.2	7.0	111.1
Korea, North	10.7				15.4
Korea, South	28.0	3.3	39–43	11–13	43.4
Mongolia	1.1	3.1			1.7
America:					
Northern America:					
Canada	19.3	2.1	24.8	7.8	26.3
United States	192.1	1.6	21.6	9.6	240.9
Middle America:					
Costa Rica	1.4	4.3	49.9	8.5	2.4
Cuba	7.3	2.0	30–34	9–13	10.0
Dominican Republic	3.5	3.6	48–54	16–20	6.2

See footnotes at end of table.

World population data sheet [1]—Population information for 129 countries—Continued

Continent and country	Population estimates mid-1964 (millions)	Annual rate of increase since 1958 (percent)	Birth rate per 1,000 population (latest [2])	Death rate per 1,000 population (latest [2])	Population projections 1980 (millions [3])
America—Continued					
Middle America—Continued					
El Salvador	2.8	3.6	48.6	10.8	4.6
Guatemala	4.2	3.2	47.7	17.3	6.9
Haiti	4.5	2.2			6.9
Honduras	2.1	3.0	45–50	15–20	3.7
Jamaica	1.7	1.5	39.6	9.1	2.1
Mexico	39.6	3.1	45.0	10.4	70.6
Nicaragua	1.6	3.5	45–52	12–17	2.8
Panama	1.2	3.3	40.1		2.0
Puerto Rico [4]	2.6	1.7	30.9	6.9	3.1
Trinidad and Tobago	.9	3.2	35.6	7.3	1.5
South America:					
Argentina	21.7	1.6	21.8	7.9	29.0
Bolivia	3.7	1.5	41–45	20–25	6.0
Brazil	79.8	3.0	43–47	11–16	123.7
British Guiana [4]	0.6	3.0	42.3	7.9	1.0
Chile	8.4	2.4	34.2	11.8	12.4
Colombia	15.4	2.2	43–46	14–17	27.7
Ecuador	4.8	3.2	45–50	15–20	8.0
Paraguay	1.9	2.4	45–50	12–16	3.0
Peru	11.9	3.0	42–48	13–18	17.5
Uruguay	2.6		21–25	7–9	3.1
Venezuela	8.4	3.4	45–50	10–15	14.9
Europe:					
Northern and Western Europe:					
Belgium	9.3	.5	17.2	12.7	10.1
Denmark	4.7	.8	17.7	9.9	5.2
Finland	4.6	.8	18.1	9.3	5.3
France	48.4	1.2	18.2	11.7	53.3
Europe—Continued					
Northern and Western Europe—Continued					
Iceland	.2	1.9	25.8	6.8	.2
Ireland	2.8	—.3	22.2	11.8	2.9
Luxembourg	.3	.9	16.0	12.5	.4
Netherlands	12.1	1.3	20.8	8.0	14.1
Norway	3.7	.8	17.5	10.0	4.3
Sweden	7.6	.5	14.8	10.1	8.4
United Kingdom	54.1	.8	18.5	12.2	57.3
Central Europe:					
Austria	7.2	.6	18.7	12.7	7.3
Czechoslovakia	14.0	.7	16.9	9.5	15.8
Germany, East	16.1	—.3	17.5	13.7	17.6
Germany, West [5]	56.2	1.3	18.5	11.4	58.5
Hungary	10.1	.4	13.1	9.9	10.7
Poland	31.1	1.3	19.0	7.5	38.0
Switzerland	5.9	2.1	18.9	9.6	6.3
Southern Europe:					
Albania	1.8	3.2	39.3	10.7	3.0
Bulgaria	8.2	.9	16.4	8.2	9.3
Greece	8.5	.8			9.5
Italy	50.8	.6	19.1	10.2	56.4
Malta	.3	.5	20.4	8.9	.4
Portugal	9.1	.7	23.5	10.8	9.8
Rumania	19.0	.9	15.7	8.3	22.3
Spain	31.3	.8	21.5	9.0	36.0
Yugoslavia	19.3	1.1	21.4	8.9	22.8
Oceania:					
Australia	11.1	2.1	21.6	8.7	14.6
New Zealand	2.6	2.2	25.5	8.8	3.7
U.S.S.R	228.6	1.7	22.4	7.5	277.8

[1] Compiled from United Nations and other sources.
[2] Latest available year. In no case before circa 1960.
[3] Medium projection (provisional U.N. estimates, 1964).
[4] Non-self-governing country.
[5] Formerly Nyasaland. Gained independence July 6, 1964.
[6] Formerly known as the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.
[7] Formerly Northern Rhodesia. Gained independence Oct. 24, 1964.
[8] Excludes West Berlin, population 2,200,000 (1964).

NOTE: Parentheses indicate regional vital rates. Blank space indicates lack of reliable statistics.

World and continental population estimates

[In millions]

	Mid-1964	1980 projection [1]
World total	3,283	4,274
Africa	303	449
Asia	1,843	2,404
North America	211	267
Central and South America	236	374
Europe	443	479
Oceania	18	23
U.S.S.R	229	278

[1] Medium projection (provisional U.N. estimates, 1964).

Population increase at various rates of growth

	Number of years to double population	In 1 century 10,000,000 increases to—
Annual increase rate (percent):		
0.5	139	16,000,000
1	70	27,000,000
1.5	47	44,000,000
2 (world rate)	35	72,000,000
2.5	28	118,000,000
3	23	192,000,000
3.5	20	312,000,000
4	18	505,000,000

Mr. DIRKSEN. So, Mr. President, the third reading having been had, I am prepared to vote, and I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, immigration and naturalization laws developed in the 18th and 19th centuries with the spread of nationalism. Since the concept of the modern nation state goes back only to the Protestant Reformation, it is understandable that laws governing the movement of large numbers of people would come about only with the growth of this concept and the improvement of transportation facilities. The states of Europe which emerged from the religious schism had the effect of giving an identity to local populations which made up the whole of Christendom. The demise of the Holy Roman Empire and the diminished authority of the papacy brought about a strong sense of nationalism to the principalities of Europe and increased the temporal and spiritual authority of local princes.

With the discovery of the Western Hemisphere and the improvement in transportation, the emigration of large populations became a matter of state policy for the first time. European countries bordering on the North Atlantic had a decided interest in colonizing their territorial claims in this hemisphere. The competition among the colonial powers further developed a sense of nationalism which spread to the Americas.

Nationalism is a feeling on the part of a citizen that his country is a living entity which will continue on after his death and that it is his duty to protect its existence and work for its continuation in the same form that he has known it. Nationalism engenders a spirit of unity among a people and a homogeneous population is one of its earmarks.

However archaic and antiquated nationalism is today, it must be recognized as a driving force in the world which still must be contended with. The vast gulf of cultural, racial and economic differences tends to further drive nations apart, especially in this day of rapid transportation and communication.

It is in this historic context that the United States as the primary recipient of European immigration has had to examine its policy of admitting aliens. The problems did not become acute nor was it a matter of great concern, until the middle 1800's, when this Nation began to industrialize, and at the same time, large numbers of South Europeans began to come here.

As long as we had free lands and the population remained culturally and racially the same, there was little need for immigration laws. When that situation began to change in the early 20th century, it became necessary for the United States to protect itself by the enactment of restrictive legislation on immigration. It is with this background in mind that I propose to discuss House bill 2580.

Mr. President, the purpose of H.R. 2580, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act is: First, to abolish the national origins quota system; and second, the repeal of the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle;

Since 1924, the United States officially established a policy of admitting immigrants to this country on the basis of national origins already represented in the United States. It was the purpose and intention of Congress in 1924 to maintain and continue the racial, ethnic and cultural traditions of the United States by admitting immigrants in proportion to their American counterparts. It was the intention of Congress that the United States should continue to be a Christian nation, populated primarily by those nationalities which compose Western Europe today.

It is now proposed that we change this system of immigration in favor of a "first come, first served" basis. It has been said that we are a nation of immigrants.

This is, of course, true, with the exception of the American Indian. However, the United States is no longer in

the age of infancy or adolescence, nor is it a vast continental area largely unpopulated. The United States is today a mature, sophisticated, highly industrialized and densely populated nation. Today, only the politicians are aware of the hyphenated Americans. The great mass of American people consider themselves only American, and this is true whether their name is "Jones" or "Janowsky."

It is contended by the advocates of immigration policy change that since 1924 the United States has abandoned its traditional concept that all are welcome and that our historic plea has been in the words of the old invitation, "give us your suffering, your homeless masses."

I submit, and history will bear me out, that the United States, from its earliest beginnings, at no time encouraged the indiscriminate migration of foreigners to our shores. The Immigration and Nationality Service states that:

> Thomas Jefferson thought it unwise to encourage immigration from monarchial governments. George Washington viewed unrestricted immigration with caution. When John Quincy Adams was Secretary of State in 1819, he stated that the Government had never officially encouraged immigration from Europe. Adams declared that immigrants were not to expect favors.

The Alien Act of 1798 empowered the President to deport any alien whom he considered dangerous to the Government. Although no immigration laws governing immigration of aliens to the United States were passed until 1875, no one advocated the opening of the floodgates to unrestricted immigration from Asia, Africa, Latin America or other areas of the world with populations dissimilar from our own. In 1875, Congress passed the first law preventing the physically and mentally ill from immigrating to the United States.

In 1882, Congress enacted the first general immigration law and excluded the mentally incompetent, convicts, and those likely to become public charges. In that same year, Congress also adopted a Chinese exclusion policy.

With rapid industrialization following the War Between the States and the beginning of the emergence of the United States as a great power, it is not at all surprising that Congress wished to protect the citizens of this country by being more selective in those whom it permitted to immigrate here. This was a period of the burgeoning technological growth and advancement of organized labor. This was a period when it became the duty of Congress to protect the American workingman from the importation of Chinese coolie labor and other cheap labor supply. There is a strange attitude in this country today on the part of some people who feel that this land and its material wealth do not rightfully belong to the citizens of this country, but in effect belong to the world's population at large.

American citizens have been taxed untold billions of dollars to support foreign governments and foreign peoples. Now we are being asked to surrender the country itself to the world's hordes who are just waiting for the immigration barriers to be lowered. Every public official in this Government knows the power of bloc voting. Bad as it is today, I dread that time which will come in the near future, if this bill is passed, when aliens will dominate the political process in this country.

Literacy is no longer a prerequisite to voting in this country, particularly in the South, and it has been strongly urged that a knowledge of the English language is not necessary. Those who wish to denounce me as a bigot may do so, but I for one want this Nation to remain Christian and civilized in the Western European and American sense of the word.

For those who worry about our image overseas and in the eyes of foreigners, I will have more to say about that in a few minutes.

To return to the historical development of immigration in the United States, in the 32 years between 1850 and 1882, more than 200,000 Chinese immigrated to the United States, which almost approximated the same number of immigrants from all over the world who came to these shores in the first 70 years of our Colonial existence. The famine in the Canton region of China is said to be responsible for the huge Chinese immigration in the latter half of the 19th century. Who knows what future famine may occur in northern Brazil, in India or in Asia, which may cause similar mass migration to this country if the national origins system is abandoned.

We have become a Nation highly industrialized, highly urbanized, with a rural population dwindling swiftly with each passing year. With our vast amount of land in this country our coastal areas are being swamped with population increases. I do not have the figures available, but I believe it is almost a certainty that most of the immigrants who have come to this country in the last 20 or 30 years have settled in the large urban areas of the Nation, particularly the east and west coasts.

I am reminded of Thomas Jefferson's partiality for an agrarian system, when he wrote to James Madison in 1787. He said:

> This reliance cannot deceive us as long as we remain virtuous; and I think we shall be so as long as agriculture is our principal object, which will be the case while there remain vacant lands in any part of America. When we get piled upon one another in large cities as in Europe, we shall become corrupt as in Europe, and go to eating one another as they do there.

Who can look at our great cities today and say unequivocally that Jefferson was wrong? Make no mistake about the immigrants who come to this country. They are not going to go down on the farm; the farm does not need them. They are going to install themselves in the Harlems, the Watts, the South Bostons and other over-crowded areas, plagued by poverty, ignorance and disease. The attempt to diffuse and assimilate the Hungarian refugees of 1956 failed miserably. By and large they returned to the big cities.

In 1891, Congress passed the second general immigration law and provided for the medical inspection of all newly arrived immigrants. It barred paupers, polygamists and those suffering from contagious diseases. That law also provided for the deportation of all aliens illegally admitted to the United States, and further created the Office of Superintendent of Immigration. Between 1893 and 1907, Congress passed several laws to further tighten the restrictions on the admission of the insane, professional beggars, anarchists and other undesirables. It was also during this time that Congress empowered the President to enter into international agreements regulating immigration, and this led to the so-called gentlemen's agreement which Theodore Roosevelt made with Japan.

In 1917 Congress codified all previous provisions which applied to the exclusion of aliens and included in this list of ineligibles, persons who were illiterate, psychopathic, chronic alcoholics, vagrants, and persons entering for immoral purposes. The law also prevented immigration of persons coming from the geographical area known as the Asiatic barred zone.

In 1921 Congress enacted the first quota law and it limited the number of any nationality entering the United States to 3 percent of foreign-born persons of that nationality who lived in the United States in 1910. Under this law, approximately 350,000 aliens were permitted to enter the country each year.

In 1924, Congress enacted the first permanent quota law and provided for the national origins system which, however, did not become effective until July 1929. From 1924 to 1929, the quota was set at 2 percent of the foreign-born residents in the United States in 1890. This reduced the yearly quota to about 164,667 persons. Under the national origins provisions, a quota was set up for each nationality. All quotas were a certain percentage of the foreign-born residents of each nationality in the United States in 1920. From 1929 the annual quotas totaled 153,714. Under the 1924 act, certain aliens were admitted as nonquota immigrants. Persons entitled to be admitted as nonquota under that act included those born in Western Hemisphere countries, their wives, husbands, and children.

The Western Hemisphere countries included Canada, Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The law further provided that wives, husbands, and children of U.S. citizens would be admitted as nonquota immigrants, together with clergymen and their families, and persons who previously had been American citizens.

In 1940, Congress passed the Alien Registration Act which required the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens who were in the United States and those who sought to enter.

In 1943, the Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed.

In 1945, the War Brides Act was passed to permit special entry of wives of Armed Forces personnel.

The following year Congress permitted Filipinos and persons belonging to races

native to India the privilege of admission to the United States. Also in 1946, the Congress enacted the G.I. Fiances Act which permitted entry into the country of fiances of Armed Forces personnel.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 permitted the immigration of 205,000 displaced persons over a period of 2 years.

It should be remembered that these special acts passed by Congress during and after the war permitting additional immigration were over and above those admitted under the yearly quota system.

In 1952, Congress enacted the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is better known as the McCarran-Walter Act. This law repealed all existing immigration and nationality laws and revised and codified all legislation dealing with immigration.

Under this act, the total immigration quotas remained substantially the same as in previous acts; however, the first 50 percent—first preference—of the quota was reserved to certain highly skilled or educated persons whose immigration would be of advantage to the United States. Second preference was given to alien parents of U.S. citizens and third preference to spouses or children of aliens who had been admitted as immigrants. The act also set up maximum quotas of 100 each for colonies and dependent areas of parent countries. The McCarran-Walter Act is still the basic law today, and it is this legislation which we are now considering for revision by the proposals contained in S. 500.

Since 1952, Congress has amended the McCarran Act and also passed special legislation for the admission of refugees. In 1953, the Refugee Relief Act authorized 209,000 persons to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants.

Further changes were made in 1957; and in 1958, Congress made it possible for the Hungarian refugees to come to the United States under Public Law 85-559. Minor changes were made in 1961, and in 1962 Congress enacted the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act and provided for assistance to refugees in the appropriation of funds to assist those who came from the Western Hemisphere countries.

This was specially designed to assist the Cuban refugees fleeing Communist persecution on that island. Also in 1962, other minor changes were made in the Immigration and Nationality Act which affected preference and priority provisions of the law.

At this point in my remarks I would like to introduce a table prepared by the Immigration and Naturalization Service which contains the figures on the numbers of immigrants admitted since 1946 through June 30, 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Immigrant aliens admitted to the United States by classes under the immigration laws, years ended June 30, 1946–52

Class	1946–59	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952
Total immigrants admitted	3,114,168	108,721	147,292	170,570	188,317	249,187	205,717	265,520
Total quota immigrants	1,500,425	29,095	70,701	92,526	113,046	197,460	156,547	194,247
Immigration Act of May 1924, and Immigration and Nationality Act	1,093,134	29,006	70,618	92,426	73,075	64,769	58,356	74,037
Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (quota)	405,535				39,899	132,577	97,960	119,982
Other acts	1,756	89	83	100	72	114	231	228
Total nonquota immigrants	1,613,743	79,626	76,591	78,044	75,271	51,727	49,170	71,273
Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, and Immigration and Nationality Act	1,221,378	33,809	49,128	54,603	52,337	49,479	48,157	68,881
Wives of U.S. citizens	200,508	2,904	5,962	8,132	7,297	10,735	8,680	16,058
Husbands of U.S. citizens	49,576	208	478	553	3,168	1,453	822	793
Children of U.S. citizens	57,886	598	5,087	5,129	3,175	2,393	1,946	2,464
Natives of Western Hemisphere countries, their spouses and children	886,588	29,502	35,640	37,968	36,394	33,238	35,266	48,391
Persons who had been U.S. citizens	1,342	63	91	136	110	86	39	32
Ministers of religious denominations, their spouses and children	9,560	432	1,336	1,592	1,233	833	731	578
Professors of colleges, academies, or universities, their wives and children	4,180	102	534	997	869	603	457	297
Other nonquota immigrants	11,738			96	91	138	216	268
War Brides Act of Dec. 28, 1945	119,693	45,557	27,212	23,016	22,214	1,694		
Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (nonquota)	4,157				314	233	595	1,982
Refugee Relief Act of 1953	188,950							
Act of Sept. 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316)	49,301							
Act of July 25, 1958, Hungarian parolees adjusting status	25,424							
Act of Sept. 2, 1958, Azores and Netherlands refugees	1,187							
Other acts	3,653	260	251	425	406	321	418	410

Immigrants admitted to the United States by classes under the immigration laws, years ended June 30, 1953–64

Class	1953–64	1953 [1]	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Total immigrants admitted	3,197,857	170,434	208,177	237,790	321,625	326,867	253,265	260,686	265,398	271,344	283,763	306,260	292,248
Quota immigrants, total	1,140,479	84,175	94,098	82,232	89,310	97,178	102,153	97,657	101,373	96,104	90,319	103,036	102,844
Immigration and Nationality Act	1,124,863	78,053	88,016	79,617	88,825	97,084	102,077	97,651	101,352	96,074	90,305	102,995	102,814
1st preference quota:													
Selected immigrants of special skill or ability	30,600	77	1,429	1,776	1,946	2,992	3,941	3,518	3,385	3,460	3,313	2,288	2,475
Their spouses and children	28,676	45	1,027	1,236	1,420	2,739	3,179	3,109	3,681	3,758	3,721	2,374	2,387
Skilled agriculturalists, their wives and children (1924 act)	321	321											
Parents or husbands of U.S. citizens (1924 act)	4,290	4,290											
2d preference quota:													
Parents of U.S. citizens	35,847	983	2,783	2,394	2,843	3,677	2,608	3,406	3,451	3,381	2,252	4,006	4,063
Unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [2]	2,409								376	931	341	392	369
Wives and children of resident aliens (1924 act)	4,133	4,133											
3d preference quota:													
Spouses of resident aliens	28,450	291	3,180	2,604	2,902	2,848	2,719	3,409	2,767	2,132	1,786	1,832	1,980
Unmarried sons or daughters of resident aliens [3]	36,618	220	2,824	2,821	4,064	3,783	2,668	4,134	3,225	3,265	2,419	3,266	3,929
4th preference quota:													
Brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens	22,406	63	1,556	1,955	1,690	1,715	2,903	2,162	1,956	2,346	2,162	2,187	1,711
Married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [2]	7,928	22	374	1,120	431	1,443	2,029	1,275	425	244	205	199	161
Spouses and children of brothers or sisters, sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [4]	11,580								1,044	2,572	2,548	2,887	2,529
Adopted sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [2]	137								55	62	16	1	3
Nonpreference quota	911,468	67,608	74,843	65,711	73,529	77,887	82,030	76,638	80,987	73,923	71,542	83,563	83,207
Special legislation (quota immigrants)	15,616	6,122	6,082	2,615	485	94	76	6	21	30	14	41	30
Displaced persons, Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (quota)	15,121	5,759	6,082	2,615	485	94	76	6			3	1	
Skilled sheepherders, act of Apr. 9, 1952 (quota)	363	363											
Foreign government officials adjusted under sec. 13, act of Sept. 11, 1957 (quota)	132								21	30	11	40	30

See footnotes at end of table.

Immigrants admitted to the United States by classes under the immigration laws, years ended June 30, 1953–64—Continued

Class	1953–64	1953 [1]	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Nonquota immigrants, total	2,057,378	86,259	114,079	155,558	232,315	229,689	151,112	163,029	164,025	175,240	193,444	203,224	189,404
Immigration and Nationality Act	1,681,285	85,015	112,854	126,135	156,808	147,243	125,591	111,341	133,087	152,382	169,346	183,283	178,200
Wives of U.S. citizens	236,980	5,916	17,145	18,504	21,244	21,794	23,517	22,620	21,621	20,012	17,316	17,590	19,701
Husbands of U.S. citizens	73,418	3,359	7,725	6,716	5,788	5,767	5,833	6,913	6,140	6,059	6,646	6,035	6,437
Children of U.S. citizens	70,896	3,268	5,819	5,662	4,710	4,798	5,970	6,869	6,454	6,480	6,354	6,981	7,531
Natives of Western Hemisphere countries	1,227,778	58,985	78,897	92,620	122,083	111,344	86,523	66,386	89,566	110,140	130,741	144,677	135,816
Their spouses and children	27,482	2,114	1,629	1,654	1,949	2,144	2,052	1,810	2,135	2,696	2,764	3,067	3,468
Persons who had been U.S. citizens	902	104	427	87	44	58	43	22	36	15	25	23	18
Ministers of religious denominations, their spouses and children	5,107	387	385	307	350	403	435	558	485	406	451	462	478
Employees of U.S. Government abroad, their spouses, and children	205	2	4	9	2	8	23	24	27	10	3	32	61
Children born abroad to resident aliens or subsequent to issuance of visa	12,117	326	358	348	412	701	926	1,228	1,458	1,411	1,495	1,611	1,843
Aliens adjusted under sec. 249, Immigration and Nationality Act [5]	22,795	----	----	----	----	----	----	4,321	4,773	5,037	3,399	2,680	2,585
Other nonquota immigrants	3,605	[6] 554	465	228	226	226	269	590	392	116	152	125	262
Special legislation (nonquota immigrants)	376,093	1,244	1,225	29,423	75,507	82,446	25,521	51,688	30,938	22,858	24,098	19,941	11,204
Displaced persons, Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (nonquota)	1,030	1,030	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Orphans, act of July 29, 1953	466	----	399	67	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Refugees, Refugee Relief Act of 1953	189,021	----	821	29,002	75,473	82,444	1,012	198	43	9	15	3	1
Skilled sheepherders, act of Sept. 3, 1954 (nonquota)	385	----	----	354	31	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Immigrants, act of Sept. 11, 1957	61,948	----	----	----	----	----	24,467	24,834	6,612	3,982	1,809	213	31
Hungarian parolees, act of July 25, 1958	30,701	----	----	----	----	----	----	25,424	5,067	122	51	20	17
Azores and Netherlands refugees, act of Sept. 2, 1958	22,213	----	----	----	----	----	----	1,187	8,870	5,472	4,796	1,888	----
Immigrants, secs. 4 and 6, act of Sept. 22, 1959	29,337	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	10,314	13,255	5,488	280	----
Immigrants, act of Sept. 26, 1961	15,525	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	11,912	2,848	765
Other nonquota immigrants, special legislation	412	214	5	----	3	2	42	45	32	18	27	12	12
Refugee escapees, act of July 14, 1960	6,111	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2,005	4,106
Immigrants, act of Oct. 24, 1962	18,944	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	12,672	6,272

[1] In 1953, figures include admissions under Immigration Act of 1924.
[2] Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, all sons or daughters of U.S. citizens over 21 years of age were classified as 4th preference quota under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Adopted sons and daughters with petitions approved prior to Sept. 22, 1959, remained 4th preference.
[3] Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, included only children under 21 of resident aliens. Adult sons or daughters of resident aliens were classified as nonpreference quota.
[4] Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, classified as nonpreference quota.
[5] Not reported prior to 1959.
[6] Includes 321 professors of colleges and universities and their wives and children.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the figures are broken down into two basic groups of quota immigrants as authorized under the national origin provision of the McCarran-Walter Act and nonquota immigrants who were admitted under other provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act or special legislation enacted by Congress. In the period from 1946 to 1959, some 3,146,168 immigrants were admitted to the United States. Of these, less than half, 1,500,425, were admitted as quota immigrants. The balance were admitted under special legislation or under other provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act which did not contain the limitation of national origins.

I believe that the record will bear out the fact that few countries have been as generous as the United States in accepting the displaced and the homeless peoples of the world.

I cannot understand those who attack our basic law simply because it attempts to continue the cultural heritage, political and social traditions of this Nation. The Congress has been more than generous in departing from the basic law of national origins to take care of special hardship cases such as the Hungarian and Cuban refugees. We have more than met our international responsibilities as a great world power in helping to alleviate the suffering of oppressed people in distressed areas of the world.

It has been argued that, because the United States contains a large land mass, it can absorb countless millions of the world's population. When the vast land area of Alaska is added to that of the U.S. mainland, it is argued that we can easily accommodate many millions more.

The fact of the matter is the total population of Alaska today is not sufficient to maintain a good-sized town and there is no indication that immigrants coming into this country desire to move to Alaska. I do not have the figures available, but I seriously doubt that any of the Cuban, Hungarian, or other refugees have migrated to Alaska. The truth of the matter is, as I have pointed out earlier, that new immigrants to this country move into the huge urban areas primarily on the east and west coasts and add further to the population explosion problem with which we and the rest of the world are faced. There are no new frontiers in the United States where pioneers can settle and establish homes for themselves and their children. Using Samuel Lubbell's definition—that a frontier exists where a man faces a fact—the only frontiers remaining in this Nation are those which exist in the sprawling urban areas where the poor and culturally backward groups must fight to maintain a subsistence living. Changes in our immigration law would only add to the ghettos which already abound in our great cities.

I have prepared a table which I am introducing at this point in my remarks, showing a comparison from 1920 through 1964 of the annual immigration figures in relation to the numbers of unemployed in this country.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Immigration, 1920–64

	Annual immigration	Unemployment (in thousands)
1920	430,001	(1)
1921	805,228	(1)
1922	309,556	(1)
1923	522,919	(1)
1924	706,896	(1)
1925	294,314	(1)
1926	304,488	(1)
1927	335,175	(1)
1928	307,255	(1)
1929	279,678	1,550
1930	241,700	4,340
1931	97,139	8,020
1932	35,576	12,060
1933	23,068	12,830
1934	29,470	11,340
1935	34,956	10,610
1936	36,329	9,030
1937	50,244	7,700
1938	67,895	10,390
1939	82,998	9,480
1940	70,756	8,120
1941–45	(2)	(2)
1946	108,721	2,270
1947	147,292	2,142
1948	170,570	2,064
1949	188,317	3,395
1950	249,187	3,142
1951	205,717	949
1952	265,520	----
1953	170,434	1,871
1954	208,177	3,580
1955	237,790	2,905
1956	321,625	2,825
1957	326,867	2,936
1958	253,265	4,681
1959	260,686	3,813
1960	265,398	3,971
1961	271,344	4,807
1962	283,763	4,008
1963	306,260	4,166
1964	292,248	3,876

[1] Unavailable.
[2] Figures for war years are not significant because small immigration and small unemployment were due to wartime conditions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it makes little sense to me to continue to accept large numbers of immigrants when we have almost 4 million unemployed in the United States at the present time. I am personally in favor of halting all immigration for 5 years in order that the problem may be thoroughly studied, with a view to determining the effects of immigration upon the

labor market, the success or failure of assimilation of these foreign groups coming into the country, and the effects upon our urban areas. It should always be remembered that immigration is a privilege to be conferred upon foreign persons by the Congress of the United States. No one has a right to become a citizen of this country, and the people of the United States are under no obligation either moral or legal to admit anyone who wishes to enter. As I have stated previously, we are no longer a small group of colonies with a small population where European and other powers have the right to dump their excess population which includes debtors, criminals, and others.

This is a mature country with a complicated social structure requiring citizens with great technical skills who can not only support themselves but who can make worthwhile contributions to the Nation.

I have read with great interest the statements of those who oppose our present immigration policy. They are, as I said before, those persons who apparently feel that the natural resources of this Nation do not belong to its citizens exclusively. They seem to be racked with guilt feelings over the fact that Americans are, by and large, much better off materially and spiritually than most of the world's population.

When the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, he made the point that, because of our national origins quota system, it was embarrassing to him to conduct our foreign policy because we showed a peculiar preference to maintain our cultural and political institutions as they have been for almost 200 years.

Mr. Rusk seems to feel it is discrimination on our part because we do not let untold numbers of orientals come into this country. I had always thought that it was the duty of the Secretary of State and his Department to conduct our foreign policy in a way which was most advantageous to the country and to represent the American people to the rest of the world for what we are and what we believe and what we wish for others. It would appear from Mr. Rusk's statement that we might have to change the whole composition of the Nation in order to make his job easier so that when he holds these interminable and innumerable conferences he cannot be accused of representing a system which discriminates. If we examine Mr. Rusk's complaint and the complaints of those foreign elements who criticize our immigration policy, it seems apparent that there is no basis at all for criticism.

He says that, when a foreigner sits down and reads our immigration law, he is immediately appalled by the fact that we prefer immigrants from western and northern Europe. Let us examine that for a moment; just how many immigrants sit down and read our Immigration Act? Mr. Rusk says that they are not aware of the fact that we have passed innumerable pieces of legislation which have permitted several million people to come into this country without regard to national origin. I suspect that these foreigners are more aware of that than the national origins provision of the McCarran-Walter Act. If they are not sufficiently aware of this legislation, it is a failure on the part of the Department of State to adequately present our position to the peoples of the rest of the world. We spend a vast amount of money to maintain an agency called the U.S. Information Agency.

If our vast bureaucracy cannot adequately inform the peoples of the world of what we have done for the sake of humanity in admitting countless millions of Hungarian, Cuban, Polish, and other foreign groups into our society, then I believe it is time to question the qualifications of those who purport to head this bureaucracy.

Secretary Rusk is vague as to who these foreigners are who find discrimination in our immigration policy. Could it be the Liberians who permit only Negroes to immigrate to their country? Could it be the Australians who bar all Negroes and orientals from entering the country "down under?" Could it be the Arabs who do not allow the infidel Christians to approach closer than 12 miles to Mecca and Medina? I was recently informed that the National Broadcasting Co. is going to establish a TV system for Saudi Arabia and that they first had to train Saudian nationals in the operation of technical equipment because only the faithful could enter these holy cities of Mecca and Medina.

Could the foreigners who criticize the United States be Africans, particularly from those new countries who do not admit any Westerners except under limited conditions? Could it be those black nationalists who are crying "Africa for the Africans?" I must say that I am at a loss to know who these foreigners are who the Secretary of State shows such deference to and whose criticism makes his job so burdensome.

According to the administration's new immigration proposals, the national origins quota system would be phased out over a 5-year period. Mr. Rusk says that this is necessary because if we did not do that those countries in Western and Northern Europe which now have priority would be swamped by the Asians and Africans coming into the United States, and that, because we must be respectful of the sensibilities of our allies—England, Germany, France, Italy—we cannot abruptly terminate this preferential treatment.

In other words, our NATO alliance might encounter difficulties if the immigration bars are suddenly lowered on a first-come, first-served basis. This system of first-come, first-served would completely push Western Europe to one side. Mr. Rusk goes on to say that we are going to show preferential treatment to the highly skilled and the superbly trained. In admitting immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, does he expect these people to come here from Tobago, the Congo, or Indonesia? I respectfully submit that the superbly trained will come either from western and northern Europe or they will not come at all.

Secretary Rusk says in his statement before the Senate subcommittee:

> The governments of these newly independent nations (Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago) have made strong representations to our Government, asking to be placed on equal footing with other American states.

It is interesting to note that Trinidad-Tobago has banned practically all immigration into that country, especially from Jamaica and Barbados. It makes one wonder. I sincerely regret that these "strong representations" from Tobago have caused our Secretary of State to tremble in the exercise of his office.

Mr. Rusk goes further in saying:

> As a leader in the struggle for freedom, we are expected to exemplify all that freedom means. We have proclaimed again and again, from the Declaration of Independence until the present day, that freedom is the right of all men. The rest of the world watches us closely to see whether or not we live up to the great principles we have proclaimed and promoted. Our blemishes delight our enemies and dismay our friends.

I do not see how any reasonable or responsible foreigner could gain the impression from our Declaration of Independence or from any of our other statements of principle that there is a legal or moral right for the world's population to move into our country. I am very much afraid that the Secretary of State has permitted Communist propaganda attacks upon our country to sway his good judgment. It is unfortunate that some foreigners may also have been taken in by these attacks upon American principle. I cannot see how anyone of reasonable intelligence can really blame the American people for wishing to maintain their cultural, ethnic, and political traditions in their historic context. My experience in traveling in the countries of the world has been that these people are not so naive or unsophisticated as to expect us to change the composition of this country to satisfy some criticism at this moment in history.

In considering the charge that American immigration policy discriminates, it is only necessary to examine the policies of other nations to readily establish that they all show a strong preference for people culturally and racially similar to their own. Some nations exclude immigrants strictly on the basis of race and religion. However, other than those nations which have these outright bans on certain groups, most countries empower a Cabinet officer, usually the Minister of Labor or Immigration, with total discretion in admitting immigrants. The laws of other countries are usually vague and the particular immigration official is guided only by considerations of labor supply, the health and character of the immigrant and the ability to become readily assimilated into the native population. It is this wide discretion which other nations use to maintain an unofficial national origins system.

Persons of foreign races are always most difficult to assimilate and, therefore, constitute a moral basis for the Minister of Labor to exclude them.

The 1952 Immigration Act of Canada, while not distinguishing specifically between races, empowers the Canadian officials with the right to exclude anyone who indicates a probable inability to become readily assimilated, or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their admission.

The Scandanavian countries show a decided preference in their laws for their own kind. Germany and Austria have special arrangements governing the interchange of citizens. There are a number of countries in the world which have no immigration policy whatever, and this is due to the fact that they are overpopulated and have been primarily concerned with emigration.

I am not at all critical of the immigration policies of other countries because of the fact that they are similar to our own. I submit that they have a reasonable basis for showing a preference for their own and that no country can be expected to import problems approaching the insoluble.

It is easily understandable to me why Britons prefer to chance the destruction of the Commonwealth rather than the destruction of the United Kingdom by passing by the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962. One need only look at the present India-Pakistan war, or the secession of Singapore from Malaysia to appreciate the valid and legitimate reasons for making distinctions of race and religion in immigration policy.

I would like to quote a short excerpt from Kenneth Rivett's book "Immigration: Control or Colour Bar," Melbourne, 1962, in which he discusses the 1952 Immigration Act of Canada.

I have selected this reference material as indicative of most nations' policy on immigration and naturalization. The quotation from this book is as follows:

> The 1952 Immigration Act (of Canada) did not distinguish specifically between European and Asian migrants, but left the government power to issue regulations governing the admission or exclusion of migrants (under art. 61) on grounds of:
>
> I. Nationality, citizenship, ethnic origin, occupation, class or geographical area of origin;
>
> II. Peculiar customs, habits, modes of life, or method of holding property;
>
> III. Unsuitability having regard to climatic, economic, social, industrial, educational, labor, health, or other conditions * * * in Canada.
>
> IV. Probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after admission.
>
> In general, these powers have been applied to limit nonwhite immigration very drastically, so that there is clearly a "racial" basis to Canada's policy, just as there is to Australia's. Yet it has not given rise to anything like the same degree of offense. One reason has been the negotiation of agreements with India, Pakistan and Ceylon, from which 300 (originally 150), 100 and 59 immigrants are admitted respectively each year.
>
> It is significant that the quota for Ceylon has generally not been filled, whereas in India over 20,000 people applied for the 150 places.

Mr. President, when the McCarran-Walter bill was sent to the White House in 1952 for approval by President Truman, he vetoed it. I voted to override the Presidential veto.

I have since resisted any substantial changes in that act, and I am not now willing to vote for all the changes proposed. I would be willing, as I said earlier, to suspend our immigration laws for, say, 5 years. I know that Congress is unwilling to take such a step in the light of the hearings had on the pending bill and expressions heretofore made by Members of Congress. I applaud the action taken by the Committee on the Judiciary in limiting immigration from the countries in the Western Hemisphere, but I cannot see my way clear to supporting the pending measure, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts yield to me so that I may address certain questions to him at this time relating to the pending bill?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am delighted to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I have received what amounts to almost a flood of mail from the people of my State opposing the enactment of this bill.

I have tried to express in the form of a few questions matters which seem to be disturbing them most. It is as to those questions which I will address my friend, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, believing that it might be a good thing to have the answers to these questions assembled in one place in the RECORD so that they can be easily furnished to the many people who have these particular objections to the proposed bill.

First, I have many letters stating that it is understood that under this bill, according to the best estimate, the number of immigrants to our Nation will be increased by something like 60,000 to 70,000 per year over the current volume of immigration.

I wish to ask the Senator if that is correct. I heard him the other day and I believe I heard him mention 60,000 people.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes. It would be between 50,000 and 60,000 and it might go up to 70,000 to 80,000. The best judgment of the people concerned with this matter is an estimate between 50,000 and 60,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Apparently there is a good estimate running as high as 70,000 from various well-informed sources that have reached me.

Let us say the distinguished Senator is of the feeling that the number will be increased. As I understand him he believes the best estimate is between 50,000 and 60,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct. I might add to that that under the present law there are about 55,000 quota numbers which are authorized and not used.

I believe last year between 102,000 and 103,000 came in under the quotas, which left about 55,000 not used.

So we expect between 50,000 and 60,000 people to come in over current experience. And this number is about equal to the quota numbers now authorized but wasted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the total would approximate 350,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe that would be correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The second question that has been raised is this: Under the present condition of continuous unemployment, which apparently is disturbing industry, labor, and Government, and all of us in this Nation, why is it deemed desirable to bring in a substantially increased number of immigrants each year?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would respond to the distinguished Senator from Florida in two ways.

We had an earlier dialog with the Senator from Iowa relating to this to some extent.

Under the present McCarran-Walter Act, 50 percent of the preferences are given to professionals. That is under the first preference. We have changed that under H.R. 2580 and the first two preferences would go to those with family relationships. Only in the third category, 10 percent of the total, are those that come in as professionals. The fourth and fifth preferences come down to different family relationships. The sixth preference is for skilled and unskilled labor. The seventh preference goes to refugees.

Even those who will come in under the third and sixth preferences, it should be noted that the provisions that will be applied to them will be more stringent than those applicable under the requirements of current law.

I believe we have been able to give assurances, certainly to the AFL-CIO and all the other groups that have been interested and have the responsibility of looking after the welfare of the jobs of American industry, that they will be not only protected in the labor market, but those who come in under these categories would not affect labor standards or conditions under which they would work.

We have had considerable testimony on this subject in committee. The case on it has been very convincing. I read from page 15 of the committee report:

> Under the provision of existing law contained in section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, foreign labor is subject to exclusion only when the Secretary of Labor certifies that either (1) there are sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, available, and qualified at the alien's destination to perform the skilled or unskilled labor, or (2) that the employment of the alien will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States. This has the effect of excluding any intending immigrant within the scope of the certification who would likely displace a qualified American worker or whose employment in the United States would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States. Under the instant bill, this procedure is substantially changed. The primary responsibility is placed upon the intending immigrant to obtain the Secretary of Labor's clearance prior to the issuance of a visa establishing (1) that there are not sufficient workers in the United States at the alien's destination who

are able, willing, and qualified to perform the skilled or unskilled labor and (2) that the employment of the alien will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of U.S. citizens similarly employed. The provision is applicable to immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, other than immediate relatives, nonpreference immigrants, and those preference immigrants who seek entrance into the United States for the primary purpose of gainful employment, whether in a semiskilled or skilled category or as a member of the professions, arts, or sciences. The certification must be obtained in individual cases before a visa may be issued to the intending immigrant.

These are the safeguards which are provided so far as the working people are concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts does not believe that the admission of 60,000 more immigrants a year will increase the unemployment problem. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. I would add that only about 45 percent of new immigrants, on the basis of past immigration experience, would go into the work force. The remainder would be consumers.

As the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] has pointed out, those who would come in under the third preference would possess particular skills which are needed in the United States. They could fill jobs which today are not filled sufficiently with trained people. By filling these jobs, these people will create more jobs for American workers.

In response to the question of the Senator from Florida, I do not believe that we are endangering either the jobs or the livelihoods of American workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. The third question which seems to disturb an undue number of my people, as reflected in the correspondence which I have received, is that they note that the immediate members of a family joining a former immigrant to the United States are not included in the quota.

I believe that applies to the spouses and children, and the father and the mother, and may even go further; but certainly a sizable number of the immediate family are not included in the quota.

Was there any reason for their being excluded from the quota?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is based upon the fundamental belief that in our immigration policy we should put a high premium on keeping families together. We feel that if an individual is sufficiently qualified to meet the other criteria, criteria which have been detailed in the bill, he should not be separated from his family, a condition which exists today under the present McCarran-Walter Act.

I refer the Senator to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which lists, under the second preference, the number of people, going into the thousands, who have family relationships and are separated from their families. We believe that preference ought to be given to them, and that they should be permitted to come into the country.

We have estimated, as the Senator from Florida has accurately determined, that the number would be between 50,000 60,000. They are included in the overall figure, which, as the Senator has indicated, is about 330,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fourth question I wish to ask—and I think I know the answer—is this: Is any distinction made between the members of families of immigrants already in the United States and those who would come in as new immigrants? Would they be included in the quota or not?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. High preference would be given to unmarried brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The first category is unmarried brothers and sisters of aliens. Then the preference goes to professional groups, which is the third preference. The fourth relates to married brothers and sisters. The fifth preference is to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. They are the ones who have close family relationship but are not given nonquota status. Therefore, a special nonquota status is given to those who are members of families of U.S. citizens.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe the Senator clearly understood my question. My question was this: Is there any difference between relatives of migrants who are already here, whether citizens or not, and relatives of migrants who will be coming in under the bill, as to their being charged or not charged to the quota?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. As I understand the bill, every person who comes as an immigrant is charged to the limitation, except certain relatives of one who is already here as an American citizen.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, if an alien is living here as a permanent resident but has not yet become a citizen, relatives may still come in as a part of the quota. Persons who come in outside the limitations are those who are relatives of American citizens.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Relatives of aliens would come in under a lower preference.

Mr. ERVIN. Under the bill, the only persons who could come in from the Eastern Hemisphere, outside the limitation of 170,000, are children, spouses, and parents of citizens of the United States. There is a further limitation that parents must be the parents of a citizen who is at least 21 years of age.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then there is a difference in the charging to the quota or not charging to the quota as between immigrants already in the United States seeking to bring their relatives in, and those who seek to bring them in with them after the passage of the law.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Florida is making a good point. His question may be misunderstood. His question is this, as I understand: If a person who comes into the United States let us say, in 1970, has relatives abroad, under what condition may he bring the relatives in? It is my understanding that under the bill, whoever comes in in 1970 will have to come in under the overall number.

Mr. HOLLAND. Regardless of how close the relationship is.

Mr. PASTORE. Regardless of how close the relationship is. In other words, the exception is being made as to the people already in the United States; and at the time of the signing of the bill there will be the authority, the exemption, in order to provide for family unification. But beyond that point, any relatives who come in new, so to speak, will come in as immigrants and must be counted among the number.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the family came in under the new law, each one would count regardless, and each would be charged to the quota.

Mr. PASTORE. To the number, not the quota.

Mr. HOLLAND. To the quota.

Mr. PASTORE. I detest the word "quota."

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not share that feeling; but they would be chargeable to that limited number and then would be permitted to come in.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But that is not the case with reference to some people, where the immigrant is already here under existing law.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is what I wanted to bring out.

My next question is this: A great many people in Florida have moved there from Canada, and we are glad to have them. Many of them have come from Latin America, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, because he has checked the situation in that State.

We have received numerous complaints from Canadian residents—many of them are citizens now—with reference to what they say would be the first restrictions ever to be imposed upon immigration from Canada, other than restrictions of health, character, and those classifications. Why were the Canadians restricted in the pending measure?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Canadians are not restricted as a nation, except as they are included in the hemispheric quota.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that, but the result is exactly the same.

If there is a limitation in part that applies to Canada and the Caribbean nations, such as Mexico and Central America, and to all of South America, that means that the restriction in part applies to all. The question is, Why was that deemed necessary, considering the very great likeness between the Canadians and ourselves, and the fact that there is no problem at all about assimilating Canadians into our communities?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I was not generally in sympathy with that amendment, so I shall ask the sponsor of the amendment to respond.

Mr. ERVIN. The majority of the subcommittee and the majority of the full

committee imposed the limitation of 120,000 on the Western Hemisphere because they felt that if this were to be a bill to abolish discrimination, the bill ought to abolish the most obvious discrimination—that which provided that all the people of the Western Hemisphere could immediately move into the United States, so far as any limitation upon numbers was concerned, whereas only 170,000 could come in from the Eastern Hemisphere.

We who favored a limitation upon immigration on the Western Hemisphere felt that the limitation should be placed now rather than be left open to a future time, when the increase in immigration from the Western Hemisphere might endanger employment. In other words, we felt that the nations of the Western Hemisphere should not be allowed to move en masse to the United States, when the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere could not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend for answering that question.

The other horn of the dilemma arises from complaints of those who have come from Latin America. We have perhaps 200,000 to 300,000 of these people in our State at the present time. Many of them are among our finest people. They say that they see no reason or no justification at a time when we are moving ahead with the Alliance for Progress and are setting ourselves up as big brothers of Latin America, in particular, for a restrictive provision relating to Latin American immigration.

I should like to have this question answered, if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will answer it, as to why we should, for the first time, propose restriction.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as I stated, I am not in sympathy with that provision. Therefore, I should like to have the Senator from North Carolina respond.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the majority of the committee felt that we had reached a point in our Nation's history at which we can no longer have unrestricted immigration from any part of the earth. The figures show that immigration from the Western Hemisphere is now in the neighborhood of 140,000 or 145,000 a year. It has been constantly increasing. Immigration from South America alone has increased by 400 percent in the past 10 years. It is necessary, if we are to have restrictions on immigration, that we should have a restriction on immigration from all areas of the world, and that we ought not to invite all the people of the Western Hemisphere to come into the United States immediately. This defect was the result of the McCarran-Walter Act placing no limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

A majority of the subcommittee and a majority of the full committee felt that we ought to place a limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere at this time before the problem became as acute as that which existed in immigration from the Eastern Hemisphere, in 1920, when we received approximately 1,500,000 immigrants in an 18-month period.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. If I understand the situation, the result of that limitation would be to place an immediate reduction on the number of possible immigrants from Canada and the rest of the Western Hemisphere, which limitation would come to a head in about 3 years.

Mr. ERVIN. It would not take effect until July 1, 1968. There would be a period of adjustment, and the number fixed would be approximately the number that comes from the Western Hemisphere at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The last question which has been posed by a good many people is, Why for the first time, are the emerging nations of Africa to be placed on the same basis as are our mother countries, Britain, Germany, the Scandinavian nations, France, the Mediterranean nations, and the other nations from which most Americans have come?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. They are sovereign nations. They are recognized by the United States. There does not appear to be any reason why we should not do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator feels that we have not learned anything at all about the difficulties which have arisen from the racial admixtures in our country, and, to the contrary, we are going to open the immigration doors equally to the African nations in the same way that we opened the immigration doors to the Western European nations.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct if he is suggesting that we are going to accept immigrants, regardless of whether they come from Africa or any other country on the basis of what they can contribute to the United States, and not on the basis of their origin or the origin of their parents.

If the question of the Senator is whether we are including the countries of Africa on the same basis as other nations, I am happy to state that the countries of Africa are so included.

The individuals from African nations who apply for admission to the United States will be considered in exactly the same way as individuals coming from Great Britain, France, Ireland, the Scandinavian countries, or any other nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may interpret that statement, the African nations would be placed on exactly an equal status with the nations of Western Europe.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has stated that accurately.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Florida that I believe the answer to that last question arose from the fact that the President of the United States and a great majority of the Members of the Senate and a great majority of the Members of the House do not entertain the same sound views on immigration that I do. They do not believe that we should continue in existence the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that the distinguished Senator has not been able to prevail in the committee, of which he is a most able member.

I fully agree that the last answer in particular demonstrates a situation which I do not believe is in accord with the experience which we are having in this country and which, to the contrary, runs in the face of the most unpleasant domestic experience which we have ever had, at least within my lifetime, in the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I will answer that question from the standpoint of those who did not entertain my own sound views on this subject. This provision was placed in the bill because a majority of the subcommittee and a majority of the full committee felt that all the nations on earth—that is, all the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere—should be placed in a position of equality in respect to the privilege of immigrating to the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has stated his position and his reservations about the elimination of the national origins quota system. However, I should like to respond to the Senator from Florida that the provisions of this bill received the overwhelming support of the members of the full committee, with some notable exceptions.

We would not be assuming our full responsibility under this particular bill, nor would we be achieving the aims and aspirations of the people who are concerned with the measure and the American people as a whole unless we clearly provided that our policy on any immigration bill would be based upon the individuals involved and not upon the country from which they came.

I believe that one of the most laudable aspects of the entire bill is the elimination of the racist factor. We have eliminated the Asia-Pacific triangle which was based solely on the basis of origin. I do not see how anyone can stand on the floor of the Senate in 1965 and oppose this legislation after looking at our present legislation which contains the crude Asia-Pacific triangle which provides "If 51 percent of your blood can be traced to that area of the world, you will be chargeable to that area regardless of your birth."

This is the very basic root of this legislation. I am delighted to be asked that question by the Senator from Florida. It is my interpretation, and I believe the interpretation of the majority of the members of the committee, and those who have read the proposed legislation, that the provisions of this bill eliminate all references to race considerations. After we pass this bill—and it will be passed—we shall consider individuals on the basis of their own merit and not consider them solely upon the basis of which country they come from or the basis of their last name, or on the basis of their religion, or the color of their skin.

As many Senators have pointed out, this is a historic occasion. The bill we will pass today will be considered, in the

light of history, as one of the most important accomplishments of this Congress.

There was a time when the drawing of distinctions among immigrants on the basis of nationality was a popular concept. But we have learned something since the 1920's. We have learned that there is no difference between people who participate in the life of our Nation. The refugee scientists who fled Nazi Germany taught us this. The Japanese-Americans who fought and died in our Armed Forces taught us this, and the 400 or more aliens currently fighting in Vietnam are continuing this fine tradition. The displaced persons who have become our community leaders reinforce this point each day. And the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have come here in recent years, who have prospered and become good Americans and who have strengthened our economy is the final proof. Today we are going to vote the lessons we have learned from them.

And I think it is extremely appropriate that this action is taken this year. It is a natural and logical extension of the increasing quality that we are bringing to our domestic and foreign policy. This is the year we have assured the equal right to vote. This is the year we have assured equality in educational opportunity. This is the year we have eliminated discrimination against the poor and the aged and the members of minority groups who are American citizens. It is only appropriate then that we eliminate this discrimination against people who want to be American citizens.

For if there is one guiding principle to this bill, it is that we are going to treat all men and women who want to come to this country as individuals, equal in the eyes of the law and subject to the same standards. We are not going to ask where they come from or who their fathers were. We will only ask, in the words of President Kennedy, what they can do for this, their new country.

Let us erase forever today the stereotype of the immigrant in our history. The cities of America no longer have the foreign neighborhoods, the cultural islands, separate, unassimilated, a drag on the Nation. They are gone and policies based on them should be gone. The immigrant of today can do a great deal for his country and he should be admitted on that basis.

This bill will also bring our immigration policy in line with the foreign policy of our country.

We have sent tens of thousands of American soldiers to Vietnam to defend the people of that country because we believe that as free people they are worthy of our support. But if the finest citizen of Vietnam wanted to come and live in America today, he would have to wait for many years.

We have made a mighty effort in the United Nations to end the dispute between Pakistan and India, because we admire the Indian people and we admire the Pakistani people and we want them to live in peace. But if the finest citizen of India or Pakistan wanted to come here to live in America, even if he were a doctor, or a scientist or a professor, or the parent of an American, he would be told, as so many have been told, that they would have to wait for many years.

We poured billions of dollars into the reconstruction of countries like Italy and Greece because we believed in the future of those countries. But even their best qualified citizens today are told that they must wait for many years, if they want to come and make a contribution to this country.

How long can we continue to show these two faces of our foreign policy? How long can we continue to say to the people of these countries "we admire you and respect you and we will help you; but if you want to live among us, we will reject you." I say we can do this no longer. We must conform our immigration policy to our policies as a Nation and our principles as a people.

The numbers involved in this bill are very small compared to the principle which it establishes. The people who will be admitted under it will continue to adjust to our country with the speed and dispatch of past immigrants. New immigrants will make more jobs than they will take. This bill will show the world that in this country by giving opportunity to some, we do not take it away from others, but expand it for all.

I strongly believe that this bill goes to the very central ideals of our country. If there is one principal characteristic that has distinguished us throughout our history it is that we are the land of opportunity. Our streets may not be paved with gold, but they are paved with the promise that men and women who live here—even strangers and new newcomers—can rise as fast, as far as their skills will allow—no matter what their name is, no matter what their color is, no matter what their place of birth. We have never fully achieved this ideal. But by striving to approach it, we reaffirm the principles of our country. Where we depart from it we reject those principles. Today we have a chance to reaffirm them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very clear answer. I want the RECORD to show that the many people from my State who have complained to me about this matter are correctly informed. As I understand it now, all nations on earth, including our mother nations of Western Europe, including the emerging nations of Africa, including the subcontinent, including the oriental nations, including Latin America, and including Canada, are placed on exactly the same basis because they are nations, and their people would be on exactly the same basis in hoping to come into our country as immigrants to join our own population.

I believe that there could not be a clearer statement of that fact than the statement made by the Senator. While he has made it with considerable fervor, I can understand that, and I believe the RECORD should show what has been brought out.

I do not believe that what we are being asked to do has been brought out in the RECORD heretofore. We are being asked to forget about origin, to forget about the percentage of people who are now here as our nationals and who are being assimilated in the bloodstream of America, to forget about the racial difficulties through which we have passed, not only during the recent clash between the people of the white and the black races, but also during World War II in the other field, as between the white race and the yellow race. We are being asked to forget about any question of that kind. Certainly I shall not find fault with anybody who has come to that conclusion. I do not question the good conscience of anybody who has come to that conclusion. However, insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, I believe that we have the complete right as a nation to safeguard ourselves and our own traditions and our own people.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he will never vote for a bill which would place all the nations on earth and the people from all those nations on exactly an equal status as to admission to citizenship in our country.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I heard the Senator refer to the countries of our origin—our mother nations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the Senator agree that there are many citizens in the United States—and they are citizens of the United States—whose mother country or country of origin was one of the countries of Africa, and that they also have a right to be here, as much as somebody who came from one of the Scandinavian countries?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida understands that about one-tenth of the citizenship of our Nation now have African origin. The Senator from Florida, after having talked with a great many people of that origin, has not been able to find many of them who have the slightest idea as to what tribe or nation or area or geographic region their people came from. It is not at all a comparable situation to that of the distinguished Senator from New York, who knows perfectly well where his people came from—Ireland—or to that of the Senator from Florida, who knows perfectly well where his people came from, Germany and England, or to the situations of most of us, or I suppose every one of us.

I see on the floor my distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] whom we all love so deeply, whose ancestry does not have to be announced, because he so clearly comes from wonderful Scandinavian stock. I see other Senators who are very proud to be able to tell where they came from. I am looking at a former Governor from Maine, with whom I talked just the other day, who was exceedingly proud of his background; I believe his people came from Poland. He is a fine representative of that country.

We are all linked to the countries which gave our parents or our ancestors birth. But the same situation does not obtain at all, I say to my distinguished friend, with the people of whom I speak.

I know a great many people of the colored race, and I suspect I have more friends among that race than the Senator would believe. I have yet to find one, in recent years, who has been able to give me much information on the subject which I am discussing.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question? Perhaps he could suggest to the Senate why it is that those who came from Africa are unable to say where they came from.

Mr. HOLLAND. They did not come as immigrants; let us put it that way. They were generally brought in on ships that were based in England, which brought in slaves to the Southland or elsewhere; and, of course, there was no way to check that situation. I have no fault to find with them. I am only stating what is the fact, that those good people have no nationality now, no race to look to, and no home country to look to except the United States, whereas the distinguished Senator from New York has a mother country to which he can look, as I think every Senator present has.

I see in the Chamber my distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], a very great Italian-American, who has been Governor of his great State. Each of us has that sort of situation.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to yield in a minute, but just now I am engaged in a discussion with my friend from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe it is correct that my family and my brothers, who are now serving in Government, were aware of the fact that our family originally came from Ireland.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator not proud of that fact?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator proud of that fact?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator will say he is proud of that fact.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If the Senator will let me finish, I think he will find that I am.

Mr. HOLLAND. All right.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am very pleased and proud of the fact that our family came from Ireland. I think some of the people the Senator has described to us, whose mother countries are the Scandinavian countries or perhaps Ireland or England or some other countries, were responsible for bringing the people from Africa to the United States in the first place, as slaves. So when the Senator says, after we have performed that kind of unforgivable act, that we should penalize them because they do not know where they came from, nor where in Africa their grandfather was born, as I am fortunate enough to know, I am surprised to hear the Senator from Florida suggest such a philosophy, and that is why I rise, in the back row of the U.S. Senate to speak.

As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has said, we are past that period in the history of the United States when we judge a person by his last name or his place of birth or where his grandfather or grandmother came from, or how much money he has or what clubs he belongs to. I hope we shall start anew, to judge people on what their merit is, on what they can contribute to the country, on what they can contribute to their communities, on what they can contribute to their families. That is the whole philosophy of the immigration bill, and that that was the whole philosophy of the civil rights bills of 1963 and 1964 and the voting rights bill of 1965.

I had hoped that the Senator from Florida would accept that point of view. I am very much surprised to hear such a philosophy raised so blatantly on the floor of the U.S. Senate, concerning the fact that we do not know where these Africans came from, that they cannot tell whether they came from the east coast or the west coast, and that therefore they should not be permitted to come here any more.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida was not stating a philosophy; he was merely stating a fact. Our Negro citizens are American citizens. The Senator from Florida has done more in his own State than the Senator from New York has done in his recently adopted State to see that Negro citizens are qualified to vote and that they do vote. He has done many other things to advance their status. But he knows what the fact is. They cannot tell where they came from, and they are not interested in going back anywhere, to a home State or a mother country, as my distinguished friend from New York, of course, takes pride in going back to a particular area of Ireland.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That does not make me any better person.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly not.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The fact that I might know I came from Ireland does not make me any better than a Negro.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator may not be, but I shall let him be the judge of that. The Senator from Florida is stating what is a fact, namely, that the bill, as it is now disclosed on the floor, assumes to open the door to immigration to this country equally wide to people from all the countries of the world, making no distinction between them, except on the basis of communism. I do not believe my distinguished friend excluded that, and that is an excluded situation that I think we should state for the RECORD. Except for that, the Oriental, the African, the Malayan, and various other people from all parts of the earth are to be equally accepted for immigration into this country and for admission to citizenship.

All I am calling attention to is that many people in my State of Florida do not agree with that principle, and they have objected to it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield in a moment. It appears from the RECORD that that is the principle upon which the pending bill is based.

The attitude of opposition to the pending bill by several thousand people in Florida who have written to me is rather fully justified now by the answers which have been put in the RECORD. I am grateful to my distinguished friends for making clear exactly what the bill means, exactly what Senators are asked to vote for, exactly how we are going to open the gates to all the people, disregarding the fact that our background is largely European and that we have gone so very far in the development of ourselves and of our resources, in giving gifts to others, and in helping all the races of the earth, whereas many of the other people have not been able to show anything comparable to that.

A nation that does not give some attention to the protection of its own rights, to the protection of its own citizenship, is a very unwise nation.

I have heard it said on the floor by one of my friends that some nations will be angry at us if we do not take the actions proposed in the pending bill. I do not believe that is true. I do not believe the nations of the earth are angry at Australia because of its restrictive immigration laws. Australia insists not only on selected nations, but also on selected individual capacities.

Australia is to be admired for its protection as it moves forward to greater status.

We shall regret it if we take this step, which is different from anything we have ever done before.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe we misunderstand the concept of what we are trying to do. Is the Senator from Florida saying that if Nigeria tomorrow were able to produce a scientist who could find a way that would make it possible for us to get to the moon before the Russians did, he should be excluded because he was black? Would the Senator do that, because he was black?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly not.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, that is what the pending bill in effect would be doing. The bill is saying, in effect, that it does not make any difference where one comes from, that it does not make any difference what the color of one's skin might be, if he can add to the glory of America he will be welcome to come into this country. That is what we are trying to do here, but the Senator is saying that many people in Florida object to anyone coming in if he is black, no matter how smart, no matter what his contribution can be, that because he is black he cannot come in.

I ask the Senator, is that what we understand to be Americanism?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Florida has it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the chair. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I do not have to

be reminded what Americanism is. I have fought on foreign soil, and in foreign skies for this Nation. I know what it is to be shot down in combat. I wonder whether my distinguished friend from Rhode Island has had any such experience?

Mr. PASTORE. I know that. I appreciate that. I applaud it. But the Senator from Florida has made the point that we have to look to the mother country because Negroes cannot look back to their tribes, or wherever they came from, because, of course, their ancestors came to America as slaves. The Senator is making the point that it is not good for the development of America, that if we allow Negroes to come into this country, as Negroes, under the standards of the pending bill, it would mean that they would have to prove that they can make a contribution to America. But because he is black, many people in Florida do not like the idea. That is the substance of the argument being made in the Chamber at this moment by the Senator from Florida. I cannot accept that as a good American argument.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, my enthusiastic friend from Rhode Island is no judge as to what a good American argument is. In the second place, let me say that my position is in no sense against the admission of anyone from anywhere. My objection is to taking a position under which we open our doors equally wide to all the people on the face of the earth, when we know perfectly well where the roots of our own background lie, where our own traditions came from, where our own inspiration comes from, and where our progress is based. We know perfectly well where we can gain people who will add instead of subtract from our opportunity to move forward.

So far as the admission of individuals of great skill is concerned, we found no difficulty at all with that at any time. The provisions of the present law, for that matter, have permitted just that kind of operation. I certainly would wish to have that kind of operation permitted in the future.

What I object to is imposing no limitations, insofar as areas of the earth are concerned, but saying that we are throwing the doors open and equally inviting people from the Orient, from the islands of the Pacific, from the subcontinent of Asia, from the Near East, from all of Africa, all of Europe, and all of the Western Hemisphere, on exactly the same basis. I am inviting attention to the fact that this is a complete and radical departure from what has always heretofore been regarded as sound principles of immigration.

That is the only point to which I invite attention. I am thoroughly within my rights in doing so. The people of my State are very much concerned about this matter. My mail also indicates that not only my people but a great many people from many other States are deeply concerned about it.

I might say to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, who has talked about Americanism, that highly patriotic bodies such as veterans' groups have gone on record as being decidedly against this radical change in our system of immigration. I invite attention to that. I have no objection to any Senator voting his convictions, and I hope that every Senator will vote his convictions—whatever they may be.

I hope the Senators will be representing their constituents when they vote on the bill. I shall be trying to do just that. I believe that is what the fundamental objective and requirement of representative government should be.

I am trying to say clearly, so that there can be no question about it, that by the questions raised by many people in Florida, I could not vote for this radical departure in our immigration policy—and I shall not do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida as he speaks for his constituents and their views on liberalizing our immigration policies. It is for that reason that I feel compelled to speak out for some of my constituents in Wyoming, namely, the more than 4,000 American Indians that live in my State. Through the eyes of the Indian, there is not a member of this body that is not an immigrant; and it ill behooves any of us immigrants to look down our noses at others who would seek but to do what our forefathers did—find a new opportunity in a new world.

Save for the voice of the Red Man in our country, no other voices raised against immigrants should be heeded or can speak with naught but ill grace.

My ancestors came from Western Europe. I believe that we should set a policy which will exemplify the kind of thing we should hold out to all the rest of the world.

Scientists have shrunk the world. Man's genius has so shriveled distance and time that we are, literally, sitting in each other's lap.

It is time that as Americans we realize that we have little right, in my judgment, to slam closed the door, once we ourselves get in the "club."

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the Senator from Florida remember, during the Second World War, what was the most highly decorated U.S. unit as a group?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have heard that the unit most decorated was the one in which the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] served so well and so valiantly. It was, perhaps, the most highly decorated.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is the Senator from Florida aware that the men who made up that unit could be described as orientals—that they were of Japanese origin?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly—I know that.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator from Florida is aware of the great contribution which they made to victory by the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. I know that perfectly well. I have frequently expressed, publicly and privately, my great affection for the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE]. I was the first southerner to sign a bill for statehood for Hawaii. I also had the honor to be invited to come out to Hawaii for its statehood celebration.

I am proud of Hawaii as our 50th State. I have no disposition at all to inveigh against anyone there. I merely state that when we open our doors wide to all the oriental nations of this earth, with some 700 to 800 million in 1 country alone, and with countless other millions in other nations, and when we offer to admit them on terms of exact equality with people from our own forefather nations, we are making a radical departure of which I cannot, and do not approve. That is the point.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator talks about opening the doors wide. The doors are open only to those who can make a contribution. The fact that someone came from Japan or China originally, the fact that someone comes from Italy, Poland, or Nigeria, makes no difference. They are all going to be considered equally as to whether they are going to be accepted into the United States. The person who comes from Japan can make quite as much of a contribution as anyone who comes from Europe, and I do not believe that he should be excluded merely because he is Japanese.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have considerable familiarity with that subject. Not only did I take the position I did with reference to Hawaii, but I had a classmate at the university who was a Chinese immigrant to this country in the old days. I saw him in later years, and was entertained by him when I went out to San Francisco. His chief claim to fame as an American was that he had been foreman of the jury which had convicted Harry Bridges in San Francisco.

The Senator from Florida has a great deal of appreciation for a great many of our people who have come from other places, but he does not want to see—and this is what it amounts to—this fruit basket turned over by having the whole world invited on the same basis to come to our land, which is the place where almost everyone else on earth wants to come, because the Senator from Florida can see the most dire consequences as a result of that policy. The Senator from Florida agrees with the expressions with respect to many people who are here. We have many people whose ancestors were Irish. We have many whose ancestors were Polish. We have many whose ancestors were Italian. We have many whose ancestors were Greek. We are proud and happy to have them. I believe this bill is a radical change in our whole immigration policy. It is unjustified, and I am only saying that I cannot vote for it.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, like the Senator from Florida, I entertain the

opinion that the national origins quota system is a wise formula on which to base our immigration law. Instead of its being founded upon prejudice, it was based upon the assumption that we should welcome to this country for permanent residence and eventual citizenship immigrants with cultural backgrounds similar to those of people already here, because such immigrants could be most readily assimilated into our population and into our life.

As Senator McCarran said, the national origins quota system held up a mirror to America and reflected America as we know it.

Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization and as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have had to study this problem since February. In my study I found that the majority of the Members of the U.S. Congress do not entertain my conviction about the wisdom of the national origins quota system of the Walter-McCarran Act. So, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization and a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I was confronted by two possible courses of action. First, I could have spent my time and my energy in fighting a lost cause for the preservation of the national origins quota system, and suffered defeat without anything constructive. That was my first possible course of action.

My second possible course of action was to recognize the inevitable, which was the abolition of the national origins quota system by a majority of the Congress, and assist other Members of the Senate who happened to be members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization to try to process the very best immigration bill we could for the United States under the circumstances, at a time when a majority of the Congress was going to abolish the national origins quota system, which I cherish, as does the Senator from Florida.

I believe I can truthfully say, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization that, in my judgment, it has brought to the Senate a good immigration bill. The bill does not open the doors for the admission of all the people all over the face of the earth. It specifically restricts immigration to three groups of people. It extends the privilege of immigration to America to the relatives of American citizens already here, people who possess not only residence in America, but the right of citizenship in America, and it restricts those relatives to certain close relatives—not to cousins who may be all over the world, but to certain specified degrees of relationship.

That is the first group to which the bill grants the privilege of immigration to the United States.

The second group is composed of near relatives of persons who have already been received into the United States as permanent residents for the eventual purpose of becoming citizens of the United States.

The third group the bill admits to the United States, from whatever country they may come, is immigrants who are able to contribute something to either the economic or cultural advancement of the United States because of their skills or because of their willingness to work in areas in which we have a short supply of labor in the United States.

The bill does abolish the national origins quota systems, which I personally would like to keep, because I think it is wise, for the reasons I have stated; but it does something to restrict immigration which has never been done before. It puts a limitation on all immigration we receive from the Western Hemisphere, and by so doing extends to the Western Hemisphere the same policy which we have extended to the Eastern Hemisphere.

The bill does one thing which I personally would not have done if I had had a majority, and that is to abolish the national origins quota system of the Walter-McCarran Act. Nevertheless, I think the bill is a good bill which is designed to restrict our immigration while extending the privilege of immigration to all on the face of the earth. However, I emphasize that it is designed to restrict immigration to near relatives of those who are already in the United States either as citizens or as immigrants who have been admitted for permanent residence and eventual citizenship, and to those persons who have something to contribute to the economic and cultural development of the United States.

So I can say that notwithstanding the fact that I regret the bill does abolish, instead of retain, the national origins quota system, in my honest judgment it is a good measure. The bill should protect America and contribute substantially to the future development of our country.

I am sorry that my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] has left the Chamber. I started to say, in jesting guise, although it is not that—it is the truth, that I cannot take too much pride in the way our first immigrants acted in this country. A great historian said that the first thing the first immigrants did when they got to America was to fall on their knees, and the next thing was to fall on the aborigines. So for that reason I do not take any great pride as an American in the conduct of our early immigrants to this country in their relations with the Indians.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I hesitate to make the comment that I rise to make because my presence in the Senate may be an excellent argument for the point that perhaps the national origins quota system should have been in effect when my father came to this country. I believe it is undoubtedly true that if it had been in effect at that time his prospects for entering this country would have been substantially reduced to the point where he might not have entered it, I might not have been born here, might not have become Governor of my State, and might not have become a U.S. Senator.

So my entire life is testimony to my conviction that the philosophy of the bill before the Senate is the right one.

I do not believe that at any time in the first century of our national existence, or at any time prior to that, immigration into this country was in accordance with any fixed relationship of numbers as between peoples from different parts of the globe or from different countries. And so the base of our population was established without any such pigeon holes, without any such fixed guidelines.

I believe that what we should have learned from that experience is not that we had accidentally found the magic formula for the relationship between national backgrounds in this country, but rather that, without any magic formula, we have been able to bring into this country people from all over the globe, and that without exception our national experience demonstrates that each of them, whatever his origin, whatever the color of his skin, was able to make a positive contribution to the advancement of this country reflecting his individual merit.

So I am convinced, as I was when my father used to tell me of his own experience at his knee, that this country is a living, dynamic, growing illustration of the fact that all of God's children, when given the opportunities of freedom, can make freedom work, not only for their own advancement, but for the benefit of the society of which they are a part.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I heard with interest the remark of the Senator from North Carolina that the first settlers fell on their knees. That is true.

The first colonial settlers landed at Cape Henry in 1607 and fell on their knees to give thanks—a little before Plymouth. They gave thanks for their safe deliverance.

Later they erected a cross there, and we still have a cross there, where they gave thanks for their deliverance.

They did not fall on the aborigines. The aborigines fell on them. The aborigines murdered my ancestor there in 1622, and he had not bothered them at all.

The distinguished Senator made this bill better by his amendment. He says he will now cooperate with the inevitable.

I shall vote against the inevitable because I still believe in two principles. First, we were wise in adopting the original plan to have people of a like kind come in that could be absorbed. Second, insofar as concerns our 3 or 4 percent unemployed, I have no confidence whatever in the so-called screening process; that we will only get the cream and the skilled. The cream and the skilled stay at home. They have no reason to leave and are not coming to a new country. We will not get that type.

I regret to say that we will be in a minority, but I feel I am honored to represent a State where I believe the majority of the residents share my viewpoint.

Therefore, I am not misrepresenting the State when I say I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, enacted under a very different political and moral climate from that which prevails today, was established on the false assumption of the superiority of northern Europeans over the other racial, cultural, and national categories of mankind. Though this doctrine is seldom overtly acknowledged by proponents of the present immigration statutes, this is the major rationale for the attempt to maintain the inequities in our current quota system. This quota system was neither wise nor equitable when it was established in 1952, and it is completely anachronistic in this year of 1965.

During the past 2 years, the American people and the American Congress have made a final and irrevocable commitment to the principle that equal opportunities shall not be denied a citizen of this country for reasons of race, color or national origin. The actions of this Congress and the actions of the prior 88th Congress repeatedly asserted that the talents and individual capabilities of a person are not determined or limited by his national or racial origins. The pending measure, H.R. 2580 extends this principle, and rightly so, to individuals of all races and nationalities in their opportunity to become American citizens.

Mr. President, it would be an evident contradiction for this Congress, which has enacted the most effective civil and voting rights legislation since the Reconstruction era, to maintain our present immigration quota system and thereby deny the validity of the basic principles we have previously enunciated.

The present quota system, which would within 3 years be eliminated by enactment of H.R. 2580, is not only unwise and inequitable; it is also shortsighted and self-defeating of the national interest. The only criteria which should be applied to immigrants to this country are those which are addressed to the capabilites and talents of the individual and not to the country of his origin. For only in this way will we be assured that new citizens of this country will bring potential enrichment to our society rather than mere uniformity with the present population balance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, since its adoption in 1920, the national origins quota system has been a stain on the fabric of American democracy. I am proud to have cosponsored and worked for the adoption of this bill to abolish the national origins quota system for the allocation of immigrant visas.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has performed a distinguished service for our Nation in shepherding this bill through hearings and through the Judiciary Committee, and guiding it to the point of final passage.

In place of the discriminatory national origins system, this bill will substitute a new system based on preferences for close relatives of American citizens and resident aliens, for aliens who are members of the professions, or skilled in the arts or sciences, to workers whose skills are needed in our country and for certain categories of refugees.

Last year the Congress took a great step toward the elimination of racial discrimination against American citizens here at home. This year the Congress has passed legislation to do away with the last remaining obstacles to the attainment of the right to vote. This immigration reform bill is no less a civil rights measure. It will end four decades of intolerance toward those who seek shelter on our shores, and who, until they have actually sought entrance, have looked upon our Nation as a refuge and a haven from intolerance.

The present national origins quota system is completely inconsistent with the principle of equality of opportunity, upon which our Nation was founded, and with our historic tradition prior to 1920. It is sheer hyprocrisy to extol the virtues of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and at the same time to uphold an immigration system which is based on the principle of racial superiority.

Mr. President, when we began limiting immigration on the basis of race or national origin, we had forgotten that the very name "America" was given to our continent by a German mapmaker, Martin Waldseemueller, to honor an Italian explorer, Amerigo Vespucci. In his book, "A Nation of Immigrants," President Kennedy reminded us that the three ships that discovered America flew the Spanish flag, sailed under an Italian captain, and included as members of their crew an Irishman, a Negro, an Englishman, and a Jew.

I could list some of the many contributions which immigrants and the children of immigrants have made and are making to our society, but such a listing would be pointless. For it can truly be said that immigrants and their descendants, Americans all, are responsible for almost all that our Nation has accomplished. In every endeavor, from the world of music to the world of art, of statecraft, of scholarship, of commerce and industry, immigrants and their children have left their indelible mark on our Nation.

Mr. President, while this bill abolishes the discriminatory national origins quota system, and establishes a preference system to unite families and to expedite the admission of skilled, professional men into this country, it is not a radical measure. This bill includes strengthened safeguards to protect our economy from job competition and from adverse working standards as a consequence of immigrant workers entering the job market. An intended immigrant, under the provisions of the immigration reform bill, will have to obtain from the Secretary of Labor certification that his entrance will not adversely affect the American job market. There are no grounds for apprehension that this bill will disadvantage American workers.

The total authorized immigrants, under the most favorable conditions, will not exceed 355,000 per year, or less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our population. Thus this immigration reform bill will not permit more people to enter our country than our society and economy can absorb. However, instead of allocating quotas based on race, available spaces will be apportioned on the basis of individual worth, and the contribution which the individual can make.

My State of Maryland is a heterogeneous one, which has profited from the contributions of individuals of many races and nationalities. Indeed, Maryland was founded as a proprietary colony, under a grant to Cecilius Calvert, Lord Baltimore, to provide a haven, an area where people could settle, free from fear of religious persecution. Our Articles of Religious Toleration was the first such declaration adopted in this hemisphere.

But I do not support this bill solely because of Maryland's heritage of religious toleration. I do not support this bill solely on account of the great contributions which citizens of other than northern European descent have made to the development of my State. I support this bill because it is just, and fair, and American to judge a man by his skills, by his potential contribution, and not by irrelevant criteria such as race, or place of origin.

Let us adopt this immigration reform bill, so that our laws will conform to our needs, and our traditions, and our ideals.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I strongly support the immigration reform bill of 1965.

Our land is a land of opportunities. Today we in the Senate have a chance to extend these opportunities to those who can make the most valuable contributions to American life.

We can never have enough talent. And we will gain more talent when the immigration reform bill becomes law.

We can never have enough new ideas. And we will have many more when the immigration reform bill becomes law.

Our present immigration laws were enacted in 1924. They did not make sense then, and they make even less sense now in today's rapidly changing world. For the national origins quota system asks only when a man was born, not what he can do. If he is lucky, and happens to live in a country with a large quota, he may be able to emigrate to the United States. If he is unlucky, and happens to be from a country with a small quota, his chances are slimmer, no matter how badly he may want to come. This is true if he is from eastern or southern Europe, or from Asia. For the national origins quota discriminates against people from nations in these areas.

The national origins quota system does not make sense for another reason. In many countries stipulated quotas go unfilled. For example, the quota for British subjects is 65,000. Yet, only 25,000 British subjects emigrate to the United States each year. Elsewhere, people eagerly await an opportunity to come. In Italy, 265,000 people have registered for admission. But the quota is only 5,666. It is clear that the prospects for legal entry into the United States are small, indeed, for citizens of a country with such a small quota.

Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 500.

Our American tradition—our tradition of opportunity—demands that we change our immigration laws.

The requirements of a nation which is reaching for the Great Society compel us to change our immigration laws.

S. 500 will do this.

The bill gives preference to people with professional, scientific or artistic ability—who will enrich our national life.

It gives preference to families of immigrants who are already here—reuniting relatives separated long before.

This bill will finally reopen the gates of America for people who should be allowed to come to our shores. Let no one think we are displacing U.S. workers from their jobs. The Secretary of Labor must certify that an immigrant's presence here will have no effect on working conditions, wages or employment.

This bill must be passed. We can no longer afford to deprive our Nation of new talent and brains. Nor can we continue to show the world a prejudicial system of admissions to our shores that contradicts everything this Nation stands for.

We have a proud tradition. Let us show we practice what we preach by making our immigration procedure more American.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I support Senate passage of H.R. 2580, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, although I wish to express my opposition to the provision which would modify the current nonquota status of nations of the Western Hemisphere and impose a quota of 120,00 annually, effective July 1, 1968.

I was pleased to be a sponsor of S. 500, the original proposal to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is similar in general to the bill being considered today.

This measure will provide a much needed and long overdue change in immigration policy. It is a limited measure, since it does not make any substantial increase in the number of immigrants who can enter each year. Its significance lies in its abolition of the quota based on national origins—a system which for the past 40 years has imposed a discriminatory procedure based on the assumed desirability or undesirability of certain ethnic and racial groups.

It is unfortunate that the national origins system was ever approved and unfortunate also that it was not removed sooner.

Times have changed and history has moved swiftly. We have in recent years, and again in this Congress, enacted significant legislation to safeguard civil and human rights and to protect the equality of all before the law. There have been Supreme Court decisions and executive orders to eliminate segregation and discrimination based on race. The bill now before the Senate is consistent with these measures and restores to our immigration policy the fundamental principle that persons are to be judged as individuals and not on the basis of race or ethnic origin. In this respect H.R. 2580 is not a new departure; rather, it represents a return to the nondiscriminatory policy which existed at the beginning of our Nation. Many of the immigrants who came to the United States in the 19th century were impoverished and unskilled; others were religious or political refugees, outcasts from their homeland. They and their children proved themselves. Immigrants have demonstrated that opportunity and individual effort, rather than racial or ethnic origin, are the essential qualities of citizens.

The bill has many other provisions which are commendable. It removes the mechanical and rigid procedures which have operated to keep families separated. It reflects positively our concern for the importance of the family. The present laws have been unworkable as regards the problem of refugees, and the bill adjusts this situation. The mentally retarded and those who have suffered mental illness will be considered in a similar manner to those who are classified as tubercular, and the bill removes the total exclusion of those afflicted with epilepsy. In these and other provisions the bill reflects understanding and concern for the dignity of the individual person.

I believe that the committee amendment to place a ceiling on immigrants from nations of the Western Hemisphere is unnecessary and unwise. There is no pressing problem of numbers which requires this limitation and in any case the qualitative controls applying to all immigrants have set adequate limitations in the past. Of course, there is no reason in theory why we could not have worldwide or hemispheric quotas, but there are many reasons based on tradition why we should not impose a numerical quota by law on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere. Mexico and Canada are neighbors with whom we have thousands of miles of common border and there is no need to place their citizens who wish to emigrate to the United States under a general quota limitation. All the nations of the Western Hemisphere share with us the settlement of the New World and a common effort to develop free and independent governments. Our nonquota policy of the past was never intended and never interpreted as discriminatory against nations outside the Western Hemisphere; rather, it was and is a mark of mutual respect and friendship and a symbol of the good neighbor policy.

A HISTORIC STEP FORWARD FOR AMERICA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, passage of this amendment to the Immigration and Naturalization Act will be a historic step in the progress of the United States toward a society of equal opportunity for all. Just as we have struggled to eliminate the barriers of poverty and race within our borders, now we are ending a system of arbitrary discrimination based on nationality and directed at future Americans. We are ending a futile effort to preserve an imaginary America by arbitrary quotas, a system which has never worked and has been honored more in the breach than the observance. Since 1952 two out of three immigrants have entered this country outside of quota limitations. When this bill becomes law, we can face the world honestly and without hypocrisy. Although we obviously cannot accept every person who wishes to be an American citizen, we can say that those who are admitted will be judged by fair and humane criteria. The report of the Judiciary Committee puts it well:

> It is the basic objective of this bill to choose fairly among the applicants for admission to this country.

Immigrants will be admitted on the basis of family relationship and needed skills; they will not be admitted or denied admission solely because of an accident of birth.

One of the fundamental purposes of this legislation is to reunite families. Parents and children of U.S. citizens or lawful resident aliens will be given a high priority preference status. This provision will end one of the cruelest hardships of the quota system, the separation of families and the disruption of family life. During my service in the Congress, hundreds of hardship cases were brought to my attention. In some instances we were able to obtain relief through the slow and difficult means of a private bill. But this procedure could not be used in every case. There are many cases in my office files now of men and women kept apart from their families. I know the often tragic hardship involved in these individual cases. The cold figures in tables of quota numbers do not tell the whole story, as my colleagues and I know it from personal experience. Passage of this bill will bring new hope and new happiness to thousands of American families.

This bill will not raise the overall numbers of immigrants, and provides clear protection for the American workingman. But it will allow skilled and talented men and women to enter this country on the basis of their abilities. Our great and varied culture has grown and flourished as it blended many nationalities and cultures into our unique American way. This bill will open the doors of our country to quality and to skill, so that men and women from every part of the world who can make a real and valuable contribution to the Great Society can come to this country to join with us in building it.

In summation, the administration bill will make it far more possible for highly qualified foreign citizens to immigrate to the United States, do away with our present discriminatory practices, and assure the fullest use of the quota numbers available. In addition, the refugee reform provisions in the bill will make it easier for people who are fleeing from tyranny to be welcomed to the United States as refugees.

The Judiciary Committee deserves the highest praise for the fine work they have done on a difficult and complex bill. Our distinguished colleague, Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, has our praise and thanks for his able management of this long-awaited reform of the immigration law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Wyoming Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 266 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Aiken	Hart	Morton
Allott	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bass	Hruska	Murphy
Bayh	Inouye	Muskie
Bible	Jackson	Nelson
Boggs	Javits	Neuberger
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Carlson	Kuchel	Prouty
Case	Lausche	Proxmire
Church	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Clark	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Curtis	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Mansfield	Smathers
Dodd	McCarthy	Smith
Dominick	McGee	Symington
Douglas	McGovern	Tydings
Ervin	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Fong	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fulbright	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Montoya	
Harris	Morse	

NAYS—18

Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Russell, Ga.
Cooper	Holland	Sparkman
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	Robertson	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson	Miller	Simpson
Bennett	Scott	Tower

So the bill (H.R. 2580) was passed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. PASTORE moved to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. HART, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. FONG, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who initially introduced the bill which formed the basis of the action that the Senate has taken this afternoon, for his constant help during the subcommittee meetings and hearings and for his participation in the debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I also extend my great appreciation to, and express my great admiration for, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who has, because of his constant attendance at the hearings and his constant intelligent questioning, brought out a number of very important and strategic facts during the course of the debate. The bill is a better bill because of his contribution.

I know that the Senator from North Carolina felt strongly about maintaining the national origins quota system. While he feels that way he nonetheless directed his full attention to the other provisions of the bill. I had some reservations on some of the suggestions he made, but the bill that was considered and passed by the Senate is a better bill because of his interest and participation.

I also express my appreciation to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who attended the hearings constantly and brought to the attention of the members of the committee some extremely important immigration and naturalization matters. The Senator from New York was extremely helpful in the subcommittee and in the full committee. He has been concerned about this matter, I know, for a great many years.

The Senator from New York has been in the forefront of all the fights on the floor of the Senate. The bill is a better bill because of his interest, his constant concern, and his invaluable contributions.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] has brought to the debate an understanding of the implications and ramifications of the previous legislation of 1924 and 1952, as it applied to the Far East. He has made a study of the problem and showed an intimate understanding of it. His speech which urged support of this legislation was one of the most exhaustive and comprehensive studies of this legislation made by any Member of this body. The Senator was in constant attendance at the hearings before the subcommittee and the full committee. He brought a unique background and experience to the discussion.

The makeup of this committee was of such a nature that we would not have been able to get the bill out of the subcommittee unless we had the leadership of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who rendered invaluable assistance in the crucial hours of the bill. He assisted when many of us were wondering whether this Congress was going to have an opportunity to act this year on a matter consistent with the other actions which have been taken in other legislation dealing with equality of opportunity. The equal right to the vote, equal opportunity for our young people in education, and a better opportunity for those who live in poverty, all these measures and the immigration bill stand out as the mark of a Congress concerned with the quality of American life.

Many of us felt that it was the responsibility of this Congress to speak out on this issue. At a critical time, the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, brought forth an understanding and comprehension of the issue and rendered invaluable assistance in having the bill passed.

Mr. President, I am deeply indebted to all of these Senators and to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], all of whom were interested in the legislation and participated in the work of the committee. They were in constant contact with me during the course of the debate. They were extremely helpful.

Mr. President, I should like to add one very important name that will always be associated with this bill. The deep concern and conviction of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, is attested to by the fact that we have been able to act successfully here today. He was concerned with it, he has been interested in it, he has followed our progress closely, and I think that his interest and his concern in designating the legislation as one of his priority measures had a great deal to do with the action of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. President, I could not let this opportunity pass without recognizing the occupant of the chair and without saying how much I recognize the contribution that the Vice President of the United States has made in bringing this legislation to the point at which this Congress and this Senate could pass the measure today.

I know that the Vice President of the United States was in the forefront of the battle in 1952. He has been interested in the problem and concerned with it. I know that he shares with all Senators the joy experienced by virtue of the passage of the bill before the Senate today.

The passage of this bill is also to the credit of the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, and the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. They, with their able assistants, such as Norbert Schlei, the Assistant Attorney General, and Abba Schwartz, Director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, worked long and hard for this victory today. I would also commend Mr. James Hines, of State, and

Mr. Robert Salasion, of Justice, and Mr. Gene Krizek, of the State Department.

Last, but not least, Mr. President, we are indebted to the staff members of the Senate Immigration Subcommittee, Mr. Fred Mesmer and Mr. Drury Blair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken about everybody but himself. I think that it is very appropriate for someone on the minority side to speak of him.

He is a young man. However, this is the second time that he has shown his outstanding ability in handing a matter on the floor of the Senate.

I just discussed with the majority leader the very extraordinary point that a highly controversial bill went through to passage without it being necessary—and I emphasize that word—to vote on a single amendment.

That is a most extraordinary record.

I, too, should like to join in the tribute paid by the Senator from Massachusetts to the other Senators.

I should like especially to emphasize the triumph of the legislative mind and the ability of the rest of us to agree on important points with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who indicated an objectivity and understanding of the legislative process which was most admirable.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts can write this event down as one of his finest hours, whatever Senators may think on the questions involved, or his views or mine, or the views on the other side.

The RECORD is very clear on that. The clearest thing in the RECORD is the vote. I am very proud of the Senate that, this afternoon, has taken, by such an enormous affirmative vote, a historic step forward in the foreign and humanitarian policy of the United States.

I think the Senator for the rest of his life will have every reason to look back at his role of Senator in charge of this bill with the greatest of gratification.

I join with the Senator from Massachusetts in thanking the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, for his assistance in this matter. I am confident that, without him, we would not be where we are. We are all very grateful to him. The country is most grateful to the minority leader.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his most gracious remarks. If it had not been for the tact and the understanding and the devotion which the Senator from Massachusetts gave to this bill, the bill would never have come from the subcommittee or the full committee in such fine form.

I am also deeply grateful to the senior Senator from New York, not only for his gracious remarks, but also for his contributions to the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I, too, join in expressing praise and thanks to the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his magnificent performance.

Two Presidents of the United States have played a historic role in the passage of this legislation. I believe that we should nail that fact in the RECORD. John Kennedy had no higher priority than the achievement of the elimination of the national origins quota system. He must be very proud to see the Senate, and more particularly, the Senator in charge of the bill, at this moment.

I doubt very much if this hour would have arrived except for Lyndon Johnson.

Some day some Ph. D. may write a thesis on how it is that a man from Texas put together all the forces and brought to bear the conscience of a country on an issue which really has very little significance constitutionally, but is on a very high moral plane. I know that any historian will seek to find the answer as to him more than anyone else.

I suggest that it may very well prove to be the combination of the two Presidents who were responsible for this moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was most gracious of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to say what he has just said about the President of the United States.

It is obvious to all, I believe, that both our late, beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and the present Chief Executive of this Nation, Lyndon B. Johnson deserve an accolade for their efforts in this field. It is in no small measure due to the efforts of both of these Presidents that we have arrived today at the historic point of passage of an immigration reform bill which abolishes the national origins quota system. I join now with those who give deserved credit to President Johnson and our late President Kennedy.

Mr. President, a cherished hope of many Members of this body, as well as many of the people of this great Nation, was realized today in the Senate's strong affirmative vote abolishing the national origins quota system in our immigration laws. This is, indeed, a historic occasion marking the culmination of the efforts of many, including all of our recent Presidents.

The national origins quota system was inequitable. But the mere abolition of that system was not enough; a workable and just substitute had to be found. Mr. President, in this bill, through the unselfish efforts of many, such a substitute is embodied. The new system of allocation is based on a system of preferences extending equal opportunity to all nationalities, demonstrating the humanity of this great nation and its continuing dedication to freedom, and yet—and this is of prime importance—fulfilling the needs of or own country. Priority in the issuance of immigrant visas is given to close relatives of U.S. citizens and aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, to aliens who are members of the professions, arts or sciences, to skilled or unskilled laborers who are actually needed in the United States, and to refugees fleeing religious or political persecution or seeking refuge from the chaos of natural disasters.

Mr. President, not enough can be said in support of these goals. I will, however, conclude these brief comments on the substance of this bill by saying that through it America will continue to be a beacon to the world. It will continue to merit the praise of the German farmer who, as quoted in the late President Kennedy's perceptive book, "A Nation of Immigrants," wrote from his new home in Missouri in 1834:

> If you wish to see our whole family living in * * * a country where freedom of speech obtains, where no spies are eavesdropping, where no simpletons criticize your every word and seek to detect therein a venom that might endanger the life of the state, the church, and the home, in short, if you wish to be really happy and independent, then come here.

It is especially appropriate, in view of the very particular interest of the late beloved President Kennedy in reform of our immigration laws, that this measure should be managed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. But as the Senator from Massachusetts has more than amply demonstrated, there were also excellent reasons on the merits why that assignment was so made. Senator KENNEDY has proven himself to be one of the most well prepared and skilled of floor managers. He is, indeed, a veteran of the Senate who has come through with flying colors under the responsibility of managing a very important and very complex piece of legislation.

A little earlier this afternoon, during discussion of this bill, we were treated to another of the sensitive, eloquent speeches of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the very distinguished and cooperative minority leader. The minority leader played no small part in the passage of this bill and I thank him, as always, for the part he has played.

Both the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Illinois are members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, which worked for many, many days to put this very important measure in shape and present it to the Senate. During those long, hard efforts and even for many years in the past, the proponents of this bill included in the forefront the other members of that subcommittee, from both sides of this aisle. Of special significance were the efforts of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who earlier this year sponsored, together with 33 other Senators, the bill which served as the blueprint for the Senate's work on the measure passed today, and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who has gained preeminence among the leaders in this country who have with perseverance and patience sought an end to the national origins quota system. I am proud that we have crowned their efforts with success today.

The subcommittee and the committee could not have succeeded without the undaunted effort and unselfish cooperation of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. The Senator from North Carolina devoted his unmatched legal skills to hammering out the provisions of this bill, and the Senator from Hawaii brought to the bill the in-depth analysis of a true scholar as well as the special sensitivity required

for adequate treatment of this most significant immigration bill.

Others lent their special skills and devoted their sharp analysis as well as eloquent remarks to this measure. Many of these have time and again over the years spoken out forcefully in favor of the goals of this legislation. I commend them all. I especially want to congratulate the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

This bill has been, Mr. President, a model of deliberative treatment by the Senate. It is, without question, one of the most important measures treated by the Senate in this most productive Congress. It restates this country's devotion to equality and freedom. I am happy to be a part of the Senate which has taken affirmative action on this truly historic legislative measure.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, which has worked on this bill, I join my colleagues in highly commending the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his dedicated effort in seeing the bill through. He has worked very hard on the bill. He has sat through many meetings and listened to a large number of witnesses with great patience. He has brought considerable knowledge to bear upon this extremely complex legislation, and it is through his dedication and very excellent leadership that the Senate has at long last passed the bill.

No doubt great credit should be given our great late President, John F. Kennedy, and our present President Johnson, for their support of the bill. But it was primarily through the untiring efforts of the junior Senator from Massachusetts that the bill has finally been brought to the floor and passed.

As a descendant of those people who came from the Far East, and as one who has felt the sting of the discriminatory features of present immigration laws, I want to say that this is a great day for the Senate of the United States. This is a bright moment in history in which so many of the Senators agreed, by their 76 affirmative votes, that this bill is just, fair, and equitable. Again I should like to commend the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his indefatigable managing of this very meritorious bill, which is far-reaching in its purview and which will stand as a beacon light to the humanitarianism, to the fair play, and to the greatness of this Nation. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has done a magnificent job. He should be very proud that he has played such a critically important part in bringing the measure to fruition.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on his skill, tact, and tenacity in managing this exceedingly complicated and far-reaching immigration bill.

It is an excellent bill and one that combines our basic ideas of man's equality to man and the needs of compassion with the realities of our political process and of our national interest.

Senator KENNEDY, in managing and fighting for this bill and its principles in the Senate, has shown an awareness of all these qualities—man's equality, compassion, our political process and national interest.

The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is to be congratulated on his sense of fair play and justice in helping this bill along to final passage. I thank him, too, for his role in the writing of this legislation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, to require establishment of water quality criteria, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Betty H. Going;

H.R. 2414. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

H.R. 4152. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4603. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 7090. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 8715. An act to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross;

H.R. 9877. An act to amend the act of January 30, 1913, as amended, to remove certain restrictions on the American hospital of Paris;

H.R. 10323. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States," and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the plans for the remainder of the day and the schedule for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, first I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 741, S. 597.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 597) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Medical" and insert "Health Science"; after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART I—ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL LIBRARIES"

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. Title III of the Public Health Serice Act is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the part heading "Part H—National Library of Medicine" and inserting in lieu thereof

"PART I—HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARIES

"Subpart 1—National Library of Medicine";

(2) By redesignating as sections 381 through 387 the sections (relating to the National Library of Medicine) now numbered 371 through 377 and references thereto, and by striking out (wherever they occur in such sections) the words "this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "this subpart"; and

(3) By inserting at the end of such title III the following new subpart:

"Subpart 2—Assistance to Health Science Libraries"

On page 2, line 24, after the word "necessary", to strike out "adequately"; in line 25, after the word "disseminate", to insert "adequately"; on page 3, line 9, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; in line 10, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "expansion, remodeling, alteration, or"; in line 11, after the word "renovation", to strike out the comma and "expansion, or rehabilitation,"; in line 12, after the word "existing", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "special"; in line 18, after the word "physicians", to insert "other health science practitioners,"; in line 22, after the word "to", to strike out "scientific, social and cultural"; in line 25, after the word "in", to strike out "the field of medical" and insert "health"; on page 4, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 8, after the word "regional", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 10, after the word "other", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 15, after the word

"this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; after line 18, to strike out:

(2) the terms "National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board" and "Board" means the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established under section 373(a) of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(2) the terms "health science library" and "library" mean a library in one or more of the fields of the sciences related to health;

At the top of page 5, to insert:

(3) the term "health library science" means library science in one or more of the fields of the sciences related to health, and the term "health science librarian" means a person trained in health library science;

At the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; in line 6, after the word "any", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 9, after the word "remodeling", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "alteration", to insert "and renovation"; in line 13, after the word "remodeled", to strike out "or"; in the same line, after the word "altered", to insert "or renovated"; in line 17, in the heading, after the word "National", to strike out "Medical" and insert "Health Science"; in line 18, after the word "Assistance", to insert "Advisory"; in line 20, after the word "section", to strike out "373" and insert "383"; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "373" and insert "383"; in the same line, after the word "National", to strike out "Medical" and insert "Health Science"; in line 24, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; on page 6, line 4, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; in line 7, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; in line 14, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; in line 17, after "(d)", to strike out "Appointed" and insert "Section 383 (d) shall apply to appointed"; in line 20, after the word "Board", to insert "traveling,"; in line 22, after the word "this", to strike out "part," and insert "subpart."; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "shall be entitled to receive compensation, per diem in lieu of subsistence, and travel expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as that prescribed under section 373(d), when attending conferences, traveling, or serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of part H which deals with the National Library of Medicine."; on page 7, line 9, after the word "any", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 18, after the word "a", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; on page 8, line 1, after the word "improved", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; on page 10, line 16, after the word "nonprofit", to insert "agency or"; in line 18, after the word "for", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; on page 11, line 8, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "for each fiscal year" and insert "over a period of four fiscal years"; in line 9, after the word "ending", to strike out "June 30, 1966" and insert "June 30, 1967"; in line 10, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970,"; in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000,000 for any fiscal year," and insert "$50,000,000 in the aggregate,"; in the heading in line 13, after the word "In", to strike out "Medical"; in line 14, after "Sec. 394.", to strike out "(a)"; in the same line, after the word "order", to strike out "to enable the Surgeon General"; in line 15, after "section 390(b)(2),", to strike out "there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $1,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by"; in line 21, after the words "Surgeon General", to strike out "in making" and insert "may make"; in line 23, after the word "to", to strike out "accept" and insert "pursue programs of study"; in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "traineeships and fellowships"; in line 25, after the word "in", to strike out "the field of medical" and insert "health"; on page 12, line 5, after the word "sciences", to strike out "relating" and insert "related"; in line 12, after the word "in", to insert "health"; at the beginning of line 13, to insert "in"; in line 14, after the word "sciences", to strike out "relating" and insert "related"; in line 16, after the word "in", to strike out "established medical" and insert "health science"; after line 18, to strike out:

(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

In line 24, after the word "to", where it appears the first time, to strike out "enable the Surgeon General to"; in line 25, after "section 390(b)(3),", to strike out "there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by"; on page 13, line 6, after the words "Surgeon General", to strike out "for the establishment of special" and insert "may establish and maintain"; in line 7, after the word "fellowships", to insert "(with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expense, as he many deem necessary)"; in line 9, after the word "physicians", to insert "other practitioners in sciences related to health,"; in line 12, after the world "contributions", to insert "(including historical studies)"; in the same line, after the word "to", to strike out "scientific, social, or cultural,"; in the heading in line 20, after the word "In", to strike out "Medical"; in line 22, after "Sec. 396.", to strike out "(a)"; in the same line, after the word "order", to strike out "to enable the Surgeon General"; in line 23, after "section 390(b)(4),", to strike out "there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by"; on page 14, line 5, after the words "Surgeon General", to strike out "in making" and insert "may make"; in line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "entering" and insert "may enter"; in line 8, after the word "for", to strike out "purposes of carrying out"; in line 9, after the word "in", to strike out "the field of medical" and insert "health"; in line 11, after the word "storing,", to strike out "and"; after line 13, to strike out:

(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be in advance or by way or reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

In the heading, in line 19, after the word "Of", to strike out "Medical" and insert "Health Science"; in line 21, after the word "to", to strike out "enable the Surgeon General to"; in line 22, after "section 390(b)(5)", to strike out "there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000, for any fiscal year, as may be necessary.

"(b) Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by"; on page 15, line 4, after the words "Surgeon General", to strike out "for making" and insert "may make"; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in the same line, after the word "and", to insert "functionally"; in line 8, after the word "basic", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 11, after the word "following", to strike out "(A)" and insert "(1)"; in line 13, after the word "materials", to strike out "(B)" and insert "(2)"; in line 16, after the word "instrumentality", to strike out "and (C)" and insert "(3)"; in line 20, after the word "and", to strike out "(D)" and insert "(4)"; at the beginning of line 21 to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; in line 23, after the word "any", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; on page 16, line 3, after the word "any", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 9, after the word "physicians", to insert "and other health science practitioners"; in line 19, after the word "affiliated", to strike out "and"; in line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 23, after the word "instrumentalities", to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and "and"; after line 23, to insert:

(G) such other factors as he may determine to be relevant.

On page 17, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in the same line, after

the word "instrumentality", to strike out "during" and insert "with respect to"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "lesser" and insert "less"; in line 10, after the word "instrumentality", to insert "or"; in line 11, after "(ii)", to strike out "or,"; in the same line, after the word "if", to strike out "lesser" and insert "less"; in line 16, after the word "instrumentality", to insert "or"; in line 17, after "(ii)", to strike out "or,"; in the same line after the word "if", to strike out "lesser" and insert "less"; in line 22, after the word "instrumentality", to insert "or"; in line 23, after "(ii)", to strike out "or,"; in the same line, after the word "if", to strike out "lesser" and insert "less"; on page 18, line 4, after the word "instrumentality", to insert "or"; in line 5, after "(ii)", to strike out "or,"; in the same line after the word "if", to strike out "lesser" and insert "less"; on page 19, after line 2, to insert:

(c) No grant shall be made under this section unless the application therefor contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that the amount of such grant will be so used as to supplement the level of funds that would, in the absence of such grant, be made available by the applicant for the purposes of this section, and will in no case supplant such funds.

After line 8, to insert:

Financial Support of Biomedical Scientific Publications

SEC. 398. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(7), the Surgeon General may, with the advice of the Board, make grants to, and enter into appropriate contracts with, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education, nonprofit professional scientific organizations, and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications and to procure the compilation, writing, editing, and publication of reviews, abstracts, indices, handbooks, bibliographies, and related matter pertaining to scientific works and scientific developments.

(b) Grants under this section in support of any single periodical publication may not be made for more than three years.

At the top of page 20, to insert:

Limitation on Appropriations for Sections 394, 395 396, 397, and 398

SEC. 399. For the purpose of carrying out sections 394, 395, 396, 397, and 398, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

In the heading in line 11, after the word "Regional", to strike out "Medical" and insert "Health Science"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "398" to "399A"; in the same line, after the word "order", to strike out "to enable the Surgeon General"; in line 14, after "section 390(b)(6)", to strike out "there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $2,500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by"; in line 20, after the words "Surgeon General", to insert "may"; in line 21, after the word "Board", to strike out "to"; in the same line, after the word "to", where it appears the second time, to strike out "existing" and insert "established"; in line 22, after the word "nonprofit", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 23, after the word "regional", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 25, after the word "grants", to strike out "made"; on page 21, line 1, after the word "be", to strike out "employed" and insert "made"; in the same line, after the word "limited", to strike out "to, the following" and insert "to"; in line 3, after the word "journals,", to insert "photographs, motion picture and other films,"; in line 6, after the word "other", to insert "services and"; in line 9, after the word "devices", to insert "facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment,"; after line 12, to insert:

(4) introduction of new technologies in health science librarianship;

At the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(6) effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966,"; in line 20, after the word "construction", to strike out the comma and "renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant considered"; in line 22, after the word "necessary", to strike out "by" and insert "in order that"; in the same line, after the word "library", to strike out "to" and insert "may"; on page 22, line 1, after the word "to", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 4, after the word "services", to insert "and"; in line 7, after the word "qualified", to strike out "requestors" and insert "requesters"; in line 9, after the word "to", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 10, after the word "potential", to strike out "of fulfilling the needs"; in line 11, after the word "for", to insert "functioning as"; in the same line, after the word "regional", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 12, after the word "any", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 14, after the word "need", to strike out "of" and insert "for"; in line 15, after the word "and", to strike out "medical," and insert "other"; in line 16, after the word "activities", to insert "in sciences related to health"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of the" and insert "in support of which such"; in line 17, after the word "library", to insert "is utilized,"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "health science"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "medical" and insert "related"; in line 22, after the word "regional", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 25, after "(d)", to insert "(1)"; in the same line, after the word "construction", to strike out the comma and "renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant"; on page 23, line 4, after the word "grant", to strike out "would" and insert "shall, in lieu of the criterion set forth in section 393(b)(2)"; in line 6, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "need for such"; in the same line, after the word "construction", to strike out "requirements of" and insert "in order to enable"; in line 7, after the word "library", to strike out "so as to be able"; in line 8, after the word "regional", to strike out "medical" and insert "health science"; in line 9, after the word "for", to strike out "basic resource materials to a library" and insert "purposes set forth in subsection (b) (1) through (5) of this section"; in line 11, after the word "exceed", to insert "(A)"; in line 13, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; in the same line, after the word "or", to insert "(B)"; in line 15, after the word "for", to strike out "basic resource materials" and insert "such purposes"; after line 20, to insert:

(2) No grant shall be made under this section for purposes set forth in subsection (b) (1) through (5) unless the application for such grant contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that such grant will be used as to supplement the level of funds that would, in the absence of such grant, be made available by the applicant for such purposes, and will in no case supplant such funds.

One page 24, after line 2, strike out:

(e) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

After line 6, to insert:

(e) Whenever the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, determines that—

(1) in any geographic area of the United States, there is no regional health science library adequate to serve such area;

(2) under the criteria prescribed in the preceding subsections of this section there is a need for a regional health science library to serve such area; and

(3) there is located in such area no health science library which, under the provisions of the preceding subsections of this section, can feasibly be developed into a regional health science library adequate to serve such area,

he is authorized to establish and maintain, as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional health science library to serve the needs of such area. The provisions of sections 381 through 386 of subpart 1 shall, so far as applicable, apply for the purposes of this subsection, subject to subsection (f).

(f) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $6,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

On page 25, after line 6, to strike out:

Financial support of biomedical scientific publications

SEC. 399. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(7), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each ficsal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $1,500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, in making

grants to, and entering into appropriate contracts with, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications of a nonprofit nature and to procure the compilation, writing, editing, and publication of reviews, abstracts, indices, handbooks, bibliographies, and related matter pertaining to scientific works and scientific developments.

(b) Grants under this section in support of any single periodical publication may not be made for more than three years.

(c) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

On page 26, at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "399a" to "399B"; in line 9, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "subpart"; in line 10, after the word "available", to insert "for obligation"; in line 12, after the word "appropriated.", to insert "Payments pursuant to any section of this subpart may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe after consultation with the Board."; after line 15, to strike out:

Regional branches of the National Library of Medicine

SEC. 3. Part II of title III of the Public Health Service Act which deals with the National Library of Medicine is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Regional branches of the National Library of Medicine

"SEC. 378. (a) Whenever the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, determines that—

"(1) in any geographic area of the United States, there is no regional medical library adequate to serve such area;

"(2) under the criteria prescribed in section 398, there is a need for a regional medical library to serve such area; and

"(3) because there is located in such area no medical library which, under the provisions of section 398, can feasibly be developed into a regional medical library adequate to serve such area,

he is authorized to establish, as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional medical library to serve the needs of such area.

"(b) For the purpose of establishing branches of the National Library of Medicine under this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall remain available until expended."

On page 27, at the beginning of line 24, to change the section number from "4" to "3"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "Part II of title III" and insert "Subsection (d) of the section"; in line 25, after the word "which", to strike out "deals with the National Library of Medicine" and insert "is redesignated as section 383 by section 2 of this Act"; on page 28, line 2, after the word "out", to strike out the comma and "in section 373(d) thereof,"; and, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

Other authority not affected

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of the Public Health Service Act or any other law, of the Surgeon General, the Public Health Service, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Health Science Library Assistance Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the part heading "PART H—NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE" and inserting in lieu thereof

"PART I—HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARIES

"Subpart 1—National Library of Medicine";

(2) By redesignating as sections 381 through 387 the sections (relating to the National Library of Medicine) now numbered 371 through 377 and references thereto, and by striking out (wherever they occur in such sections) the words "this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "this subpart"; and

(3) By inserting at the end of such title III the following new subpart:

"Subpart 2—Assistance to Health Science Libraries

"Declaration of Policy and Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 390. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) the unprecedented expansion of knowledge in the health sciences within the past two decades has brought about a massive growth in the quantity, and major changes in the nature of, biomedical information, materials, and publications, (2) there has not been a corresponding growth in the facilities and techniques necessary to coordinate and disseminate adequately, among health sicentists and practitioners, the ever increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been developed in the health science field; (3) much of the value of the ever increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been, and continues to be, developed in the health science field will be lost unless proper measures are taken in the immediate future to develop facilities and techniques necessary to collect, preserve, store, process, retrieve, and facilitate the dissemination and utilization of, such knowledge and information.

"(b) It is therefore the policy of this subpart to—

"(1) assist in the construction of new, and the expansion, remodeling, alteration, or renovation of existing health science library facilities;

"(2) assist in the training of health science librarians and other information specialists in the health sciences;

"(3) assist, through the awarding of fellowships to physicians, other health science practitioners, and scientists, in the compilation of existing, and the creation of additional, written matter which will facilitate the distribution and utilization of knowledge and information relating to advancements in sciences related to health;

"(4) assist in the conduct of research and investigations in health library science and related activities, and in the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information in the sciences related to health;

"(5) assist in improving and expanding the basic resources of health science libraries and related facilities;

"(6) assist in the development of a national system of regional health science libraries each of which would have facilities of sufficient depth and scope to supplement the services of other health science libraries within the region served by it; and

"(7) provide financial support to biomedical scientific publications.

"Definitions

"SEC. 391. As used in this subpart—

"(1) the term 'sciences related to health' includes medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and public health, and fundamental and applied sciences when related thereto;

"(2) the terms 'health science library' and 'library' mean a library in one or more of the fields of the sciences related to health;

"(3) the term 'health library science' means library science in one or more of the fields of the sciences related to health, and the term 'health science librarian' means a person trained in health library science;

"(4) the terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction', when used with reference to any health science library facility, include (A) the construction of new buildings, and the expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings (whether or not expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated) for use as a library (including provision of automatic data processing equipment) but not with books, pamphlets, or related material.

"National Health Science Libraries Assistance Advisory Board

"SEC. 392. (a) The Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established pursuant to section 383(a) shall, in addition to its functions prescribed under section 383, constitute and serve as the National Health Science Libraries Assistance Advisory Board (hereinafter in this subpart referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall—

"(1) advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this subpart; and

"(2) consider all applications for construction grants under this subpart and make to the Surgeon General such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to (A) the approval of such applications, and (B) the amount which should be granted to each applicant whose application, in its opinion, should be approved.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any member or members of the Board, in connection with matters related to the administration of this subpart, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Section 383(d) shall apply to appointed members of the Board who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences of the Board, traveling, or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of this subpart.

"Assistance for Construction of Facilities

"SEC. 393. (a) In carrying out the purpose of section 390(b)(1), the Surgeon General may, upon application of any public or private nonprofit agency or institution, make grants to such agency or institution toward the cost of construction of any health science library facility to be constructed by such agency or institution.

"(b) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is

recommended for approval by the Board and is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than ten years after completion of construction, the facility will be used as a health science library facility, (B) subject to subsection (c), sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the purpose for which it is being constructed;

"(2) the proposed construction is necessary to meet the demonstrated needs for additional or improved health science library facilities in the community or area in which the proposed construction is to take place;

"(3) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on the construction of the facility will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) Within such aggregate monetary limit as the Surgeon General may prescribe after consultation with the Board, applications which (solely by reason of the inability of the applicants to give the assurance required by clause (B) of subsection (b)(1)) fail to meet the requirements for approval set forth in subsection (b) may be approved upon condition that the applicants give the assurance required by such clause (B) within a reasonable time and upon such other reasonable terms and conditions as he may determine after consultation with the Board.

"(d) In acting upon the applications for grants under this section, the Board and the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in meeting demonstrated needs for additional or improved health science library services, and shall give priority to applications for construction of facilities for which the need is greatest.

"(e) The amount of any grant made under this section shall be that recommended by the Board or such lesser amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate; except that in no event may such amount exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of the construction of such facility as determined by him.

"(f) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this section, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (e), and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this subsection may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(g) In determining the amount of any grant under this section, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this section, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"(h) If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit agency or institution, or

"(2) the facility shall cease to be used for health science library purposes, unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him after consultation with the Board, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States District Court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"(i) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated over a period of four fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums, not to exceed $50,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary.

"Grants for Training in Library Sciences

"SEC. 394. In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(2), the Surgeon General may make grants—

"(1) to individuals to enable them to pursue programs of study leading to post-baccalaureate academic degree in health library science, in related fields pertaining to sciences related to health, or in the field of the communication of information;

"(2) to individuals who are librarians or specialists in information on sciences related to health, to enable them to undergo intensive training or retraining so as to attain greater competence in their occupations (including competence in the fields of automatic data processing and retrieval);

"(3) to assist appropriate public and private nonprofit institutions in developing, expanding, and improving, training programs in health library science and in the field of communication of information pertaining to sciences related to health; and

"(4) to assist in the establishment of internship programs in health science libraries meeting standards which the Surgeon General shall prescribe.

"Assistance to Special Scientific Projects

"SEC. 395. In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(3), the Surgeon General may establish and maintain fellowships (with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expense, as he may deem necessary) to be awarded to physicians, other practitioners in sciences related to health, and scientists for the compilation of existing, or writing of original, contributions (including historical studies) relating to advancements in sciences related to health. In establishing such fellowships, the Surgeon General shall make appropriate arrangements whereby the facilities of the National Library of Medicine and the facilities of libraries of public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning may be made available in connection with the projects for which such fellowships are established.

"Research and Development in Library Science and Related Fields

"SEC. 396. In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(4), the Surgeon General may make grants to appropriate public or private nonprofit institutions, and may enter into contracts with appropriate persons, for projects of research and investigations in health library science and related activities and for the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information pertaining to sciences related to health.

"Grants for Improving and Expanding the Basic Resources of Health Science Libraries and Related Instrumentalities

"SEC. 397. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(5), the Surgeon General may make grants of money, materials, or both, to public or private nonprofit health science libraries and functionally related scientific communication instrumentalities for the purpose of expanding and improving their basic health science library or related resources. The uses for which grants so made may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion picture and other films, and other similar materials, (2) cataloging, binding, and other sevices and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library or related instrumentality, (3) acquisition of duplicating devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment, and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library or related instrumentality by those who are served by it, and (4) introduction of new technologies in health science librarianship.

"(b)(1) The amount of any grant under this section to any health science library or related instrumentality shall be determined by the Surgeon General on the basis of the scope of library or related services provided by such library or instrumentality in relation to the population and purposes served by it. In making a determination of the scope of services served by any health science library or related instrumentality, the Surgeon General shall take into account the following factors—

"(A) the number of graduate and undergraduate students making use of the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(B) the number of physicians and other health science practitioners utilizing the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(C) the type of supportive staffs, if any, available to such library or instrumentality;

"(D) the type, size, and qualifications, of the faculty of any school with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated;

"(E) the staff of any hospital or hospitals or of any clinic or clinics with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated;

"(F) the geographic area served by such library or instrumentality and the availability, within such area, of health science library or related services provided by other libraries or related instrumentalities; and

"(G) such other factors as he may determine to be relevant.

"(2) In no case shall any grant under this section to a health science library or related instrumentality with respect to any fiscal year exceed $200,000, or if less, an amount equal to—

"(A) 60 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, if such fiscal year is the first fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section is made to it;

"(B)(i) 50 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, five-sixths of the amount of its first year grant under this section, if such year is the second fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(C) (i) 40 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, four-fifths of the amount of the second year grant under this section, if such year is the third fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(D) (i) 30 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, three-fourths of the amount of the third year grant under this section, if such year is the fourth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it; and

"(E) (i) 20 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, two-thirds of the amount of the fourth year grant under this section, if such year is the fifth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it.

The 'annual operating expense' of a library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of the preceding sentence, be an amount equal (if such annual operating expense is to be determined with respect to the first grant to be made to such library or instrumentality under this section) to the amount of the average of the annual operating expenses of such library or instrumentality over the three fiscal years preceding the year in which such grant is applied for; and if such library or related instrumentality has been operating for less than three years prior to applying for such grant, its 'annual operating expense' shall be an amount determined by the Surgeon General pursuant to regulations prescribed by him. For the second or succeeding fiscal year in which a grant is made to a library or related instrumentality, the 'annual operating expense' of such library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of such sentence, be equal to its operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding fiscal year.

"(c) No grant shall be made under this section unless the application therefor contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that the amount of such grant will be so used as to supplement the level of funds that would, in the absence of such grant, be made available by the applicant for the purposes of this section, and will in no case supplant such funds.

"Financial Support of Biomedical Scientific Publications

"SEC. 398. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(7), the Surgeon General may, with the advice of the Board, make grants to, and enter into appropriate contracts with, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education, nonprofit professional scientific organizations, and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications and to procure the compilation, writing, editing, and publication of reviews, abstracts, indices, handbooks, bibliographies, and related matter pertaining to scientific works and scientific developments.

"(b) Grants under this section in support of any single periodical publication may not be made for more than three years.

"Limitation on Appropriations for Sections 394, 395, 396, 397, and 398

"SEC. 399. For the purpose of carrying out sections 394, 395, 396, 397, and 398, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"Grants for Establishment of Regional Health Science Libraries

"SEC. 399A. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(6), the Surgeon General may, with the advice of the Board, make grants to establish public or private nonprofit health science libraries so as to enable each of them to serve as the regional health science library for the geographical area in which it is located.

"(b) The uses for which grants under this section may be made include, but are not limited to—

"(1) acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion picture and other films, and other similar materials;

"(2) cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library;

"(3) acquisition of duplicating devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment, and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library by those who are served by it;

"(4) introduction of new technologies in health science librarianship;

"(5) acquisition of mechanisms and employment of personnel for the speedy transmission of materials from the regional library to local libraries in the geographic area served by the regional library; and

"(6) effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, construction necessary in order that such library may carry out its proper functions as a regional library.

"(c) (1) Grants under this section shall be made only to health science libraries which agree (A) to modify and increase their library resources so as to be able to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region as well as individual users of library services, and (B) to provide free loan services to qualified users, and make available photo-duplicated or facsimile copies of biomedical materials which qualified requesters may retain.

"(2) The Surgeon General, in awarding grants under this section, shall give priority to health science libraries having the greatest potential for functioning as regional health science libraries. In determining the priority to be assigned to any health science library, he shall consider—

"(A) the need for such library, as determined by the levels of research, teaching, and other activities in sciences related to health in support of which such library is utilized, in relation to other existing health science library and related communication services in the region;

"(B) the adequacy of the library (in terms of collections, personnel, equipment, and other facilities) as a basis for a regional health science library; and

"(C) the size and nature of the population to be served in the region in which the library is located.

"(d) (1) Grants under this section for construction shall be made in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as are provided for grants made under section 393, except that the eligibility for any such grant shall, in lieu of the criterion set forth in section 393(b)(2), be determined on the basis of the need for such construction in order to enable the library to serve as a regional health science library. Grants under this section for purposes set forth in subsection (b) (1) through (5) of this section may not exceed (A) 50 per centum of the library's annual operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this subpart) for the preceding year; or (B) in case of the first year in which the library receives a grant under this section for such purposes, 50 per centum of its average annual operating expenses over the past three years (or if it had been in operation for less than three years, its annual operating expenses determined by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by him).

"(2) No grant shall be made under this section for purposes set forth in subsection (b) (1) through (5) unless the application for such grant contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that such grant will be so used as to supplement the level of funds that would, in the absence of such grant, be made available by the applicant for such purposes, and will in no case supplant such funds.

"(e) Whenever the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, determines that—

"(1) in any geographic area of the United States, there is no regional health science library adequate to serve such area;

"(2) under the criteria prescribed in the preceding subsections of this section there is a need for a regional health science library to serve such area; and

"(3) there is located in such area no health science library which, under the provisions of the preceding subsections of this section, can feasibly be developed into a regional health science library adequate to serve such area,

he is authorized to establish and maintain, as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional health science library to serve the needs of such area. The provisions of sections 381 through 386 of subpart 1 shall, so far as applicable, apply for the purposes of this subsection, subject to subsection (f).

"(f) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $6,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

"Continuing Availability of Appropriated Funds

"SEC. 399B. Funds appropriated to carry out any of the purposes of this subpart for any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation for such purposes for the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. Payments pursuant to any section of this subpart may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe after consultation with the Board."

Compensation of Members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of the section of the Public Health Service Act which is redesignated as section 383 by section 2 of this Act is amended by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75".

Other Authority Not Affected

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of the Public Health Service Act or any other law, of the Surgeon General, the Public Health Service, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that the Senate will be able to dispose of the health science library bill today. The distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is on the floor, prepared to give the Senate an explanation as to why his committee voted out the measure unanimously. When it is disposed of, it is anticipated that Calendar No. 693, H.R. 10871, a bill

making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies, will be laid before the Senate and made the pending business this evening. There will be no action taken on that bill, once it is laid down. It is the hope of the leadership—and we have discussed this with interested Members on both sides—that it will be possible, when the foreign aid appropriations bill is laid down, to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is it in order, ahead of time, to make a unanimous-consent request about a bill which will be laid before the Senate subsequently?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, it may be done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at the conclusion of the prayer tomorrow morning, there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment on the appropriation bill, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and that there be 2 hours on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I have a fairly important speech I had scheduled for tomorrow. Would the Senator allow me 10 minutes to make that speech?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, the senior Senator from Oregon will wish to make a few remarks tonight as to his reasons for agreeing to the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the unanimous-consent agreement is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, September 23, 1965, after the prayer, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10871) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]: *Provided,* That in the event he is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, September 23, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIME AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5688) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the action of the House of Representatives today in knocking the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project out of the public works bill is a stunning setback, after the smooth sailing of this project in the Senate without opposition. It is unbelievable that the House would knock the project out. It is even more unbelievable that a member of the President's own political party would offer the amendment and lead the successful opposition to this project. It is now up to President Johnson to save the project by exerting his personal persuasion on the conferees. That is the only hope for the project at this time.

HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 597) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has approved S. 597, the Health Science Library Assistance Act of 1965.

Over the past two decades we have developed more new information in the field of health than we have in the entire history of medicine. This new knowledge, if it is to be fully utilized, must be made available to physicians, dentists, and other practitioners, to hospitals, and to institutions for training health manpower.

The testimony presented to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at hearings on S. 597 showed the plight of our health science libraries. The American Medical Association presented the findings of a 1964 study that showed:

Only 15 of the 87 medical school libraries have sufficient space;

More than one-half of the medical school libraries were built prior to 1933;

As long ago as 1957 more than one-half of the medical school libraries were filled to capacity or had exceeded their capacity;

Only 14 of 87 existing medical schools have the recommended level of 100,000 volumes on their library shelves; and

There are 6,000 health science libraries but only 3,000 librarians with specialized training or experience in the health science library field.

The rapid rate at which we are accumulating new medical knowledge makes it imperative that we take action now to strengthen and expand our health science libraries.

CONSTRUCTION

S. 597 would authorize an aggregate of $50 million over a 4-year period, 1967–70, for grants to nonprofit institutions to pay up to 75 percent of the costs of constructing health science library facilities.

TRAINING, RESEARCH, BASIC RESOURCES

The legislation would also authorize appropiations of $45 million for the 5 years 1966–70 to finance first, training of health science library personnel; second, assistance to special scientific projects dealing with advancements in the sciences related to health; third, research and development in health library science; fourth, improvement of basic library resources; and fifth, temporary support for scientific publications.

REGIONAL HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARIES

To supplement health science library services, the bill authorizes appropriations of $22.5 million over the fiscal years 1966–70 to establish and maintain regional health science libraries. The need for regional service has become acute with the growth in the size of the medical literature. It is neither economically feasible nor necessary for each medical library to try to build its collection to encompass even a sizable part of the whole of medical literature.

In total S. 597 authorizes appropriations amounting to $117.5 million over the 5 years 1966–70. The legislation is supported by the Medical Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, the Special Libraries Association, the Chairman of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American College of Physicians, the American Heart Association, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, and the Medical Library Center of New York. Many other associations, universities, colleges, and individuals contacted the committee in writing to express their support for S. 597.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to join the Senator from Alabama, who has done such great work in this field. As the Senator knows, I have been active in title II of the Higher Education Act, trying to do something in connection with library facilities. This is another step in the same area, which I congratulate the Senator on accomplishing.

I raised one question prior to this time, which is a fundamental principle, so far as I am concerned, whether we had a limiting authorization for each year, or whether the authorization was open ended. My understanding is that the committee changed it so that it is a limiting authorization; is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Let me take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Senator from Colorado for the fine help which he gave in having the bill acted upon by the committee.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to have been able to cooperate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my congratulations and compliments to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his leadership in carrying through the present bill before the Senate to the point of passage, which is about to take place.

As the Senator from Alabama knows, we on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over all education legislation, are very much concerned with the problem which confronts us in connection with the libraries of the United States.

There are various educational institutions, as the Senator from Colorado has just pointed out, in the higher education bill, S. 600—in regard to which we go to conference with the House tomorrow—which has a title devoted to the question of providing Federal assistance to institutions of higher learning in this country, in an endeavor to raise library standards and to provide more adequate facilities for the students of the country.

One of the features of that kind of bill is a provision that will be of assistance to the Library of Congress, providing funds and facilities so that the Library of Congress can be of assistance to the college libraries of the country—public libraries also for that matter—in helping them to improve their library services.

The need, however, for assistance to medical libraries is just as great, and it falls under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of the Senate committee, over which the chairman of the full committee also serves as chairman of the subcommittee.

The bill the Senate is considering stands in the same class, in my opinion, with the title of the higher education bill which provides similar assistance to the libraries of the country. I am very glad that the Senator has been persistent in regard to this matter.

Let me say to the medical profession that this is another example of Federal aid which the medical profession has received from the taxpayers of the country for decades. This is another example that proves the position I have taken over many years, when I have listened to doctors opposing medical care legislation, that their memories are short, that the assistance and aid which the Federal Government has given them over the years, in payment of part of their medical expenses, and providing the laboratories and facilities so that they could become doctors, puts them, in my judgment, in an untenable position when Congress seeks to come to the health assistance of the needy and aged of this country with a medical care bill.

Be that as it may, I wish the doctors of this country to know that once again I can be counted upon to come to their assistance in seeing to it that facilities are provided so that we can continue to train the best doctors in the world. I say that because American doctors are the best doctors in the world. The trouble is that a great many of them lack a social conscience.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that he has rendered a great service in behalf of having the committee report the bill favorably to the Senate. He is here now to vote for passage of the bill. He has rendered outstanding service in the passage of the higher education bill, which does so much for libraries generally throughout the country, and which will be of vast significance and great help to these libraries.

I express my appreciation to him for what he has done to help in the passage of the pending bill, and also for the great work he did in passage of the higher education bill, which will do so much for libraries generally.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate health science library services and facilities."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949 RELATING TO CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9336) to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9336) to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, the Committee on Foreign Relations is discharged from further consideration of the bill.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause in H.R. 9336 and substitute certain language therefor.

I should add, the language in the amendment which I am proposing is identical to that which is contained in S. 1826, the Cuban claims bill passed by the Senate on September 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

That section 501 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1643) is amended—

(1) by striking out "which have arisen out of debts for merchandise furnished or services rendered by nationals of the United States without regard to the date on which such merchandise was furnished or services were rendered or"; and

SEC. 2. Section 503(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643b(a)) is amended by striking out "arising out of debts for merchandise furnished or services rendered by nationals of the United States without regard to the date on which such merchandise was furnished or services were rendered or".

SEC. 3. Section 505(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643d) is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof as follows: "A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon a debt or other obligation owing by any corporation, association, or other entity organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be considered only when such debt or other obligation is a charge on property which has been nationalized, expropriated, intervened, or taken by the Government of Cuba."

SEC. 4. Section 506 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643e) is amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That the deduction of such amounts shall not be construed as divesting the United States of any rights against the Government of Cuba for the amounts so deducted".

SEC. 5. Section 511 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643j) is amended to read as follows:

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to pay its ad-

ministrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my support of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17, as previously passed by the U.S. Senate, which is now awaiting concurrence by the Senate with House amendments. This resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress in condemnation of the persecution of Jewish citizens by the U.S.S.R., is a measure of the indignation aroused in many areas of the world by the discriminatory treatment being accorded its Jewish minority by the Soviet Government.

By focusing the attention of the world on the restrictive treatment accorded to Russian Jewry, there may be some hope of greater relaxation of the rigid regulations on the religious practices of that faith and other faiths.

It is not surprising to me when the U.S.S.R., as a basically atheistic nation, acts to repress those who profess religious beliefs. I can but hope that the Soviet Government, in an effort to enhance its public image abroad, may make it easier for Jewish citizens and others to practice their respective faiths. Actually, I am told that action in recent times to permit the printing of approximately 10,000 Yiddish prayerbooks represented some concession, although, admittedly, a small one in view of the approximately 2½ million Jews in Soviet Russia. I am also informed that representatives of the Yiddish theater groups have been permitted some travel among parts of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, all church groups are heavily restricted in Russia, although, perhaps, the Russian Orthodox Church fares better than others as it does have an organization in Russia.

Visitors to that country report that while the synagogues are poor in appearance, the Baptist Church also is in poor condition.

Again, I wish to associate myself with the pending resolution condemning the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion. I am proud to have served as one of its cosponsors.

THE PRESIDENT'S LAWYER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States, Nicholas Katzenbach, has won the respect and admiration of a great many people both in and out of Washington. His efforts on behalf of the Voting Rights Act passed this year, as well as other actions on behalf of justice for all our citizens, have won acclaim from leaders in the race relations field across the Nation. We are fortunate to have such a competent man of convictions and skills as head of the Justice Department.

A recent issue of the Indianapolis Star presented a profile view of Mr. Katzenbach in an appraisal written by Joseph E. Mohbat, of the Associated Press. I ask unanimous consent that this article, subtitled "The President's Lawyer," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S LAWYER—NICK KATZENBACH OUTLINES HIS FOUR MAIN GOALS

(By Joseph E. Mohbat)

WASHINGTON.—One of the newest weekend visitors to President Johnson's retreat at Camp David, Md., is a bald-pated, tall, somewhat dishevelled man who—according to Washington gossip—wasn't supposed to last long enough to get his name on the big office door in the Department of Justice.

Nicholas deBelleville Katzenbach, the 65th Attorney General of the United States, has by all signs won the esteem of the Chief Executive.

The President, according to some, looks upon the 43-year-old lawyer as one of the brainiest men in government today.

Yet, for 5 months Nicholas Katzenbach cooled his heels, holding the title of Deputy Attorney General and hearing the stories that Lyndon Baines Johnson would most certainly bring in another man to replace ROBERT F. KENNEDY. KENNEDY was leaving last year to run for the Senate from New York, and the notion was that Mr. Johnson felt Katzenbach was too closely identified with Kennedy.

But in January Katzenbach got the word. He was going to be Attorney General. As such, he became a member of the Cabinet, "the President's lawyer" so to speak, and head of the Department of Justice. The Department, with 30,000 employees, runs such wide-ranging affairs as the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, antitrust prosecutions, enforcement of civil rights legislation, the Bureau of Prisons, and the U.S. marshals.

What does Katzenbach have to say about his job? What are his goals as the Nation's highest law officer?

"It's hard to talk about it generally," he says, "except for my obvious feeling that it's terribly important to achieve an even-handed administration of justice, and that it be done entirely on merits.

"I guess there are four things I'd really like to accomplish, if I have enough days, months, or years allotted to me here:

"I think our fiscal and administrative system in the Department is outmoded, and I'd like to do something like Secretary McNamara did over at Defense. I'd like to know how much it costs us to administer justice, and thus I'd know a lot more about my Department. I'd like to know, for instance, to what extent we could use computers on the Immigration Service or the FBI.

"I'd like to come as near as possible to clearing up civil rights problems enough so that you almost wouldn't need a civil rights division in this Department to insure that Constitutional guarantees are being enforced. This would be best for the country, certainly.

"It would be hard to find anything more important than the job to be done on the crime front. (Katzenbach heads the newly formed National Crime Commission.) We're going to step up the drive against organized crime. I want to see what we can do with crime in the streets.

"And I'd like to see whether we can come up with a good, rational, coherent, effective, and understandable antitrust policy. Perhaps we simply haven't articulated it well enough in the past. But I think the influence of our antitrust division should go far beyond actual cases; it should influence and reflect the economic policies of the Government."

The President's lawyer pauses a moment, then says:

"I don't know—perhaps I've bitten off more than I can chew. But I'd sure like to try it."

As a public official, Katzenbach is admired by his supporters for two main reasons: his gift as a conciliator, and his willingness to stand up and be counted when he feels it's required of him.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Communications Satellite Act—these and other legislative milestones are in many ways monuments to the long hours Katzenbach spent in Capitol Hill, conciliating the sharply divergent views of lawmakers as the bills ground through Congress. As a result, it is easy to find responsible officials in Congress and the administration who feel, as one government lawyer of 25 years put it, that "Nick Katzenbach was the civil rights bill."

"If I had to name my own skills," Katzenbach admits, "I'd have to list first my ability to get people to agree to something."

On 2 consecutive days, Nick Katzenbach stood up when he could have played it cozy by staying away.

He fully backed the appointment of James P. Coleman, a Mississippi segregationist with whom he had been in sharp opposition, as a Federal judge in the South. Without Katzenbach, Coleman would have had to go it alone in convincing the Senate he would adhere to the law in his decisions as a judge.

Katzenbach also strongly defended Internal Revenue Service agents who had been caught with their wiretaps showing. His own department wasn't directly involved, but the IRS has contributed mightily to the Justice Department's drive on organized crime, and Katzenbach wasn't forgetting it.

"I could have told you he'd do that," says Katzenbach's wife, Lydia. She contends she can accurately predict his reaction to any given situation.

'He feels that a person operates from an inner core that develops and solidifies as he grows older," she explains. "And so he feels that when he's confronted with a difficult choice, he really, deep within himself, doesn't have much choice."

He also has a reputation as being slow to anger.

"I guess I get mad only when I feel my honor has been impugned, or if I been had," he says. On one occasion, a business group hinted it would bring high-level political pressure to bear on him if he opposed a merger important to the group.

" 'If I decide to go ahead with this suit,' " he says he told them "political pull won't do you any good unless another Attorney General is in this office." He later went ahead with the suit.

He has also demonstrated he can keep cool in the most trying of circumstances. Millions of TV viewers were bystanders when Katzenbach had his famous confrontation with Alabama Gov. George Wallace at the door to the University of Alabama in 1963. In a fascinating 13-minute scene, Katzenbach told the Governor that under the Constitution two Negroes seeking entrance had every right to enroll in the university. Then Governor Wallace responded with a long statement in which he said State law would prevail. The Negroes were denied entrance then, but the school has since been integrated.

Later when Katzenbach spotted Wallace at an inaugural ball for President Johnson, he murmured to a companion, "I've got a mad urge to go over and say, 'Governor, I'm Nick Katzenbach. I don't think we've ever been formally introduced.' "

"As a result of that confrontation," says Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, "and his general conduct in office, the Negro community has complete confidence in his understanding of its problems and his attitude toward them."

By the yardstick, Nicholas Katzenbach measures 6 feet 2 inches, but he gives the appearance of being much larger. He weighs 232 pounds, has brawny shoulders, a thick and powerful neck and large hands. One might expect a booming, thundering voice, but instead it is soft and soothing.

His suits are forever rumpled, although his wife insists he spends good money on clothes and would like—in the rare moments when he gives it any thought—to look neat. His garish, unmatching ties have become a trademark. His shirts, with few exceptions, are out at the elbows. His shoes rarely show a shine, and the fringe of light brown hair surrounding his bald dome often approaches his frayed collar.

Even among those who are closest to Katzenbach, there are few who have noticed—or know why—the right elbow of his shirts wears out first. Or why he chainsmokes his king-size filter cigarettes with an awkward, half bending of the right arm.

To grasp that elbow is to feel solid, swollen bone. Katzenbach is a victim of Page's disease—"Osteitis deformans"—a painful bone condition that usually attacks older men and results in an enlargement and deformity of the affected bones. The ailment—which was discovered in 1959 and frequently causes him intense discomfort—seems to be localized—although there's another touch of it in one hip.

Characteristically, he dismisses the ailment with: "It's a mess. But I don't think about it much."

Katzenbach suffers acute discomfort when he feels he is trapped in a crowd. Sometimes, says Lydia Katzenbach, he feels close to fainting.

During the President's state of the Union address to Congress last January Katzenbach sat in the front row with the Cabinet. Bathed in television lights, surrounded by sweltering human beings, he was so distressed that he made it through the evening only by a mental game in which he fixed in his mind the precise location of every exit from the House Chamber.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF MALI

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, today is the Independence Day of the Republic of Mali. It is the fifth anniversary of the day when French Sudan became the Republic of Mali and withdrew from the French community.

I know other Senators join me in wishing Mali well at this time of celebration in that West African country. Mali's relations with its neighbors have been strengthened as time has passed, and we all hope that, under the administration of President Keita, Mali will continue to grow and develop successfully.

I hope, too, that Mali can continue to have relations with the United States which are as friendly as possible within the framework of Mali's policy of nonalinement in world affairs.

On this Independence Day, then, I know that other Senators join me in wishing to see Mali achieve its aspirations in harmony with the other developing nations of Africa.

THE GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Government bond market is not only a critical and massive component of the complex of capital markets which have developed in the United States. The Government bond market has also historically been a crucial leading indicator of fundamental economic trends. In a special article on the front page of the August 30 Wall Street Journal, George Shea has provided precise documentation of the way in which the behavior of the Government bond market has called the turn on the business cycle during the past 10 years. In each case—1956–58, 1959–60, and 1961–62—a downturn in the Government bond market has been followed by a decline in stock prices and, finally, by a general turn toward recession.

As Mr. Shea points out, the Government bond market has shown marked weakness during the summer months of this year. On the one hand, this cannot be taken as any sort of clear signal that serious trouble is ahead for the U.S. economy; in the past, downturns in the market for Governments have gone on for many months before the economy has suffered. But, on the other hand, we must be constantly vigilant and aware of any and every indication of weakness amidst the general, unprecedented strength of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article by George Shea be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

Since the final week of July the bond market, led by prices of U.S. Government bonds, has been declining almost every day. The significance of such a decline, if it persists, is that it often, though not always, precedes a decline in stock prices, followed by a downturn in general business.

This sequence of events is well established in both economic theory and in the economic records. The late Leonard P. Ayres more than 30 years ago wrote a book in which he traced this sequence in the business and financial cycles of the previous 100 years. And Arthur F. Burns, president of the nonprofit National Bureau of Economic Research, in 1950 wrote a description of the typical business cycle—a description used again with minor revisions in a 1961 bureau publication—from which the following relevant sentences are quoted:

"Let us then take our stand at the bottom of a depression and watch events as they unfold. Production characteristically rises in the first segment of expansion. Indeed, every (economic) series moves upward except bond yields and bankruptcies. In the second stage the broad advance continues, though it is checked at one point—the bond market where trading begins to decline. Bond prices join bond sales in the next stage; in other words, long-term interest rates—which fell during the first half of the expansion—begin to rise. In the final stretch of expansion, declines become fairly general in the financial sector. Share trading and stock prices move downward.

"These adverse developments soon engulf the economic system as a whole, and the next stage of the business cycle is the first stage of contraction."

Within the past 10 years, furthermore, the sequence of downturns in bonds, then stocks, then business has been repeated more than once. Instances of it took place in 1956–58, 1959–60, and to a partial extent 1961–62.

In the 1956–58 case, U.S. Government bond prices began to slip off in the first half of 1956, edged down further in the second half and lost ground steadily after February 1957. Stock prices turned down in the second half of 1956, recovered in the first half of 1957 to about the 1956 high—reaching 521 for the Dow-Jones industrial average in July—then fell 100 points as measured by that average in 3 months. Business started losing ground in August 1957 and declined until April 1958.

In the 1958–60 business expansion Government bond prices declined pretty steadily throughout, thus not conforming to the standard pattern of rising bond prices in the first stage of a business expansion. But otherwise the pattern was normal. The fall in bond prices continued until January 1960, and in that very month stock prices started their decline, which lasted into October, falling nearly 120 points from a top of about 685 as measured by the industrial average. Business turned down after May 1960, bottoming out in February 1961.

The 1961–62 experience differed in that although the bond-stock sequence was the usual one business didn't follow with a downturn only leveling off from spring to fall in 1962. Government bond prices fell from May 1961 to February 1962; and stock prices skidded from December 1961 to June 1962, with the industrial average losing 200 points from a top of 735.

Obviously, a decline lasting 1 month in bond prices, such as the one since late July, cannot be compared by itself with these previous instances when bond prices fell for months on end. However, the latest decline doesn't stand by itself; it can be regarded as an extension of mild downtrends which have taken place in the past couple of years.

These downtrends can be identified as having started with the year 1963, following the recovery in bond prices that came after the bond-stock decline of 1961–62. The monthly average yield of U.S. Government bonds with maturities of 10 years or more has been going up, with substantial interruptions, since December 1962.

At the top of the 1962 bond price recovery, in December, this monthly average yield was 3.87 percent. From there the yield rose slowly to an April 1964 high of 4.20 percent, after which it receded to 4.12 percent last November. Then it rose again to 4.16 percent in February this year, after which it held just below that figure through July. Since late that month it has gone up again, with the daily average reaching 4.21 percent at the end of last week.

That this trend may persist is suggested by several factors in the general economic background. Capital-spending plans of American industry, the rising expenses of the Vietnam war, and the normal rising trend of State and local government outlays all suggest that demand for credit is likely to continue strong, putting upward pressure on the cost of borrowing money.

How the credit resources of the Nation are being strained is reflected in banking statistics. In the year ended August 18 the banks that report weekly to the Federal Reserve System sold $3.2 billion of U.S. Government securities in order to obtain the money to make loans and other investments.

If the various forces pressing on the credit supply continue to cause bond prices to fall and yields to rise, this trend will have to be recognized as one of the same general magnitude as those which preceded stock and business declines of the past. Up to the present the rise in yields cannot yet be re-

garded as having definitely gone above the 4.20 percent average for the whole month of April 1964, as the figure of 4.21 percent late last week reflected the closing prices of only 1 day.

Furthermore, the problem of timing is difficult. There is no standard duration for the bond-price drops that foreshadow stock and business declines. The 16-month rise in bond yields to April 1964 was not followed by any general decline in stock prices or business. Quite the contrary, the industrial average continued to move up with only minor interruptions for a year, and business has continued rising through July of this year. Still, the warning being given by the direction in which bond prices and yields are moving is worth keeping in mind.

THE U.N. TRIUMPH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this is a day to count our blessings. A cease-fire has been achieved in the dangerous war between India and Pakistan, thanks to the effective work of the United Nations.

Congratulations are due Secretary-General U Thant for his determined efforts to arrange a truce, and to the Security Council for the vital role it played in bringing about a cessation of the hostilities. We can be proud also of the contribution made by Mr. Arthur Goldberg, our distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations.

From the beginning, President Johnson directed American policy in an astute and skillful manner. His decision to refrain from provocative declarations, his insistence that the United States observe a neutral posture, and his refusal to intervene directly in the war, are welcome indications that our diplomacy was tempered with discretion and restraint.

Most of all, we have reason to be thankful that the United Nations retains the vitality to do such great work in the cause of peace. The hands of the clock which were moving toward general war have again been stopped. A halt to the conflict, so imperative to world peace, has been achieved by the one organization to which all nations can repair.

In this country, there has been far too much tendency to deplore the failures of the United Nations, as though we had some right to expect miracles. By demanding too much from the U.N., we have often given it credit for too little.

President Johnson and U.N. Ambassador Goldberg, however, have never made the mistake of underestimating the importance of the world organization. They have continued to give strong U.S. support to the United Nations. Understanding the important role of the U.N. in the maintenance of world peace, the administration cooled down the simmering article 19 crisis earlier this summer, and thus helped to keep the U.N. intact.

Because the U.N. had been getting too little credit in our country, I introduced, in June of this year, a resolution in the Senate—Senate Concurrent Resolution 36—which reaffirmed American support of the U.N. Joining me in sponsoring this resolution were Senators FULBRIGHT, HICKENLOOPER, CLARK, AIKEN, and COOPER. This resolution passed both Houses of Congress before the President journeyed to San Francisco to address the U.N.'s 20th anniversary celebration. The expression of congressional support contained in the resolution has been rewarded well.

The United Nations has a history of extensive accomplishment in damping brushfires which might have led to bigger wars. In helping mediate various crises such as Berlin in 1948 and Cuba in 1962, the U.N. has also helped avert possible war between the great powers. In its role in the Korean war of 1950, the Suez crisis of 1956, and in the conflicts in the Congo and Cyprus in this decade, the U.N. has played a vital part in the restoration of peace.

Now, in its 20th anniversary year, the United Nations may well have achieved its most important peacekeeping success on the subcontinent of Asia. In doing so, it gives even greater validity to Beardsley Ruml's famous 1945 prediction:

> At the end of 5 years you will think the U.N. is the greatest vision ever realized by man.
>
> At the end of 10 years, you will find doubts within yourself and all through the world.
>
> At the end of 15 years, you will believe the U.N. cannot succeed. You will be certain that all the odds are against its ultimate life and success. It will only be when the U.N. is 20 years old that you will revere and laud the dedication of those who devote their energies to it throughout its turbulent course. For then we will know that the U.N. is the only alternative to the demolition of the world.

The course of the United Nations will continue to be turbulent, but we should pause today to pay tribute to those who have devoted their energies to its maintenance. The necessity for a United Nations has never been clearer than in the early morning hours today when the cease-fire was arranged between India and Pakistan. A tense world can now pause to breathe at least a momentary sigh of relief.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] without losing my right to the floor.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1966

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 693, H.R. 10871.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10871) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

FOREIGN AID AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the concern of Senators regarding U.S. balance of payments is proper. But to judge whether foreign aid is justified by looking at its balance-of-payments impact is like determining the necessity of an operation by measuring its probable pain. Of course, there will be some balance-of-payments outflow from foreign aid, but the necessity of the program in terms of U.S. security and long-term U.S. interests is sufficient justification for its costs—both in terms of dollar appropriations and balance of payments.

It is highly ironic that as foreign economic aid has become a small and decreasing factor in the current U.S. balance of payments, charges have increased that the AID program is a major cause of our dollar deficit abroad.

Since 1959, in response to the changed situation of the U.S. balance of payments, the U.S. Government has taken measures respecting the use of assistance funds. Before this time, our aid dollars had not been tied to expenditures in the United States, and as the European economies revived and prospered, these countries became increasingly effective competition for U.S. aid purchases.

With only a few exceptions, funds provided by the current AID program can only be spent in the United States for goods and services produced in this country. Many people still think that AID simply ships bundles of U.S. dollars to the less developed countries, and that these countries then spend the dollars wherever and on whatever they choose. The fact is, of course, the overwhelming portion of funds appropriated to AID stay right here in the United States to finance exports of the machinery, equipment, spare parts, and so forth which the developing countries require in their efforts to grow.

This new policy of tying assistance funds is responsible for the substantial decrease in the effect of these programs on the balance of payments.

Let me be specific in regard to this improvement: David Bell testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee this year that AID's preliminary estimates for the calendar year 1964 showed that AID payments abroad had dropped to about $400 million—less than half the figure in fiscal year 1962.

The current expenditure rate under our economic assistance program is almost exactly $2 billion per year. Thus in 1964, for every dollar of economic aid extended, 20 cents showed as a current adverse impact in our balance of payments—not considering current or future receipts.

Put the other way round, 80 percent of AID's expenditures last year were spent right here in the United States for American goods and services.

Moreover, the proportion of AID appropriations spent in the United States is rising. Eighty-six percent of newly appropriated AID funds are now being committed for direct expenditure in the United States.

I am not just talking about the AID funds which finance purchases of commodities in the United States, I am talking about all AID expenditures—expenditures on U.S. services as well as U.S. products. These include items such as the costs of participant training in the United States, freight payments to U.S. shippers and administrative expenses. These latter costs constitute roughly one-third of all AID expenses.

Mr. Bell also testified that AID payments abroad in calendar 1964 were offset by repayment of past assistance extended by AID and the predecessor foreign assistance agencies of over $150 million. This means, Mr. President, that the net adverse effect of the AID program on the balance of payments in 1964 was only $250 million.

The total U.S. balance-of-payments deficit in fiscal year 1964 ran to about $3 billion. Clearly, the AID program was only a small factor in this total deficit.

Overseas expenditures of AID dollars, Mr. President, are a price that America must pay for conducting a foreign aid program.

They are part of the price we pay in our continuing efforts to raise the standard of living in the less-developed countries, and help create the conditions necessary for a stable world community of free and independent nations. In short, they are a price of leadership. U.S. soldiers are stationed throughout the world to preserve the peace.

We must spend dollars abroad to maintain these soldiers, but we rightfully do not resist these costs. I believe that the AID funds which necessarily must be spent abroad are likewise a necessary cost of promoting the U.S. interest.

There are, of course, indirect effects of the AID programs which cannot be recorded so easily on the accountants' ledgers. Very often dollars which enter the economy of a less-developed country from offshore AID expenditures may be used later by that country to buy needed goods in the U.S. market, or may go through trade channels to a third country, which will use the dollars for purchase of goods and services in the U.S. market. This is the so-called feedback effect. It means that the negative effect of the AID program on the balance-of-payments accounts is overstated.

In some cases, however, imports available under tied U.S. aid procurement are substituted for imports that would otherwise have been purchased with free foreign exchange in commercial channels. Of course, to the extent this occurs, U.S. commercial exports decline as U.S.-financed exports increase. But many of these dollars will also come back to the United States through third countries. The fact is U.S. commercial exports are rising—not declining—in the less-developed countries where AID maintains economic assistance programs. Between 1959 and 1964, U.S. commercial exports rose in 9 far eastern countries from $428 to $623 million; in 12 near east and south Asia countries, U.S. commercial exports rose from $466 to $692 million; they rose in 17 African countries from $260 to $265 million; and in 19 Latin American countries, they rose from $2,739 to $3,252 million.

Even more impressive is the fact that the total U.S. share of the worldwide export market is rising, despite the increased prosperity and competitiveness of other developed countries.

The fact that U.S. export trade in the less-developed countries is improving and not deteriorating should not be surprising. The evidence is plain that countries which we aid and help achieve steady economic growth better markets for U.S. exports are more attractive places for U.S. investment abroad. Over the last 15 years our exports to Europe have doubled and our exports to Japan have tripled. As other countries—Spain, Greece, and Taiwan, for example—gain economic momentum and our aid comes to an end the same kind of result is evident. And because the aid program introduces and familiarizes the less-developed countries with U.S. products and services, I regard the AID program as one of our best long-run export promotion mechanisms.

It has also been claimed that AID expenditures are a direct cause of our gold flow. This is not correct. In fact, current AID recipients are selling more gold to the United States than they are purchasing. During 1964, these AID recipients sold $89 million worth of gold to us for dollars, and purchased $26 million of gold. The U.S. gold problem lies with the industrial countries of Europe, not in our relations with the AID recipient nations.

In conclusion, not only has AID successfully reduced the impact of its programs on the balance-of-payments deficit to a minimum, but the present programs will have a long-range positive impact on our balance of payments. This positive impact will result from increasing amounts of dollar repayments on previous AID development loans, expanding markets for our exports and improving opportunities for our private investment abroad.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, a cut in the AID appropriations would have only a very small impact on our balance of payments. The real result would be injury to our own interests and to our efforts to influence the course of the future in the less-developed countries. I support the AID program. It is good policy; it is also good business.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA ON AUTOMOBILES AND AUTOMOBILE PARTS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee today reported a bill to approve the agreement between the United States and Canada with respect to automobiles and automobile parts carried thereupon.

An extremely important part of this deal is the side agreements between the Big Four automobile manufacturers in the United States and Canada and certain Canadian interests.

I shall take occasion to call attention to these unusual features when the bill is on the floor of the Senate. This is special interest legislation—very special—for the exclusive benefit of the Big Four, or rather Big Three and a Half automobile manufacturers in the United States and the Canadian economy.

The victims will be the automobile parts manufacturers and the labor employed in that industry in the United States, the U.S. economy, and our balance-of-payments position.

I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "That Auto Pact," appearing in the Washington Post of today. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT AUTO PACT

In January President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson of Canada signed an agreement that was widely heralded as a measure to establish "free trade" in automobiles between the two countries. In later releases the term "freer trade" was substituted. And now, with House hearings completed some time ago and a parade of witnesses still appearing before the Senate Finance Committee, the public is learning that words do not always mean what one wants them to mean.

The pending legislation and supporting agreements provide for elimination of Canadian and U.S. import duties on all shipments of new automotive products—but not replacement parts—from one qualified manufacturer to another. The major Canadian manufacturers, which are subsidiaries of U.S. corporations, are to guarantee that they will schedule operations so as to maintain a fixed proportion between jobs in Canada and Canadian auto sales.

The agreement is defended by the administration as a workable solution for a most difficult problem. Canada, anxious to improve her trade balance, attempted to increase her auto exports by a tariff remission scheme that clearly violated the spirit, if not the letter, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This country, in order to avoid levying a countervailing duty and risking the possibility of a Canadian reprisal, agreed to a plan under which Canada is awarded a much greater share of the total automotive employment than she would have under the present tariffs or in a genuine common market for automobiles.

The proponents of the bill place great emphasis on the economies of large-scale production that will be realized, but they are silent about the prices that Canadian consumers will pay. Auto prices are substantially higher in Canada, and so long as the "free" trade is confined to producers and denied to consumers, the price differential will remain and the putative economies of scale will not be fully realized. Canadian consumers, in short, will be paying a rather high price for a dubious guarantee of auto employment in their country.

Beyond the welfare of Canadian consumers, the implications of the measure for international trade policy are clearly disquieting. An agreement confined to the two countries violates the most-favored-nation (MFN) principle of GATT under which a tariff concession granted to one country must be extended to all. The State Department feels sure that a waiver can be obtained from GATT. But such waivers are just what undermines the principles on which a liberal international order rests. Why not amend the bill so as to extend the duty-free treatment to all countries on an MFN basis? The question of reciprocity

could then be placed on the agenda of the Kennedy round.

The debate over the auto agreement has been conducted in an atmosphere of urgency that is not justified by the cold facts. Contrary to the impressions harbored in certain Government quarters, the Canadians are not in a strong position to precipitate a trade war. Therefore, before this country consummates a radical agreement in violation of the MFN and other principles that it has consistently espoused, another effort should be made to resolve the auto tariff problem by more orthodox means.

UNITED NATIONS INTERVENTION IN WAR THREATS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as was just pointed out by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in the past couple of hours the press tickers of the AP and UP have been carrying stories announcing that, through the intervention of the United Nations, a cease-fire agreement has been entered into between India and Pakistan. Of course, that brings great relief to the world.

There are those who point out, and quite properly so, that, of course, the procedures of the United Nations are vital when they are used in a good-faith endeavor to substitute the rule of law for the jungle law of military might.

I am very proud that my country joined with other members of the Security Council in supporting a United Nations intervention in the war between Pakistan and India.

For more than 2 years the senior Senator from Oregon has stood shoulder to shoulder with the great Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. We have been the two voices in the Senate who have consistently and persistently urged that the United States live up to its treaty obligations under the United Nations Charter in respect to its outlawry in Asia. For those 2 years we have been urging that the United States carry out its treaty commitments and obligations under the United Nations Charter by calling upon the United Nations to take jurisdiction over the threat to the peace of the world, in which the United States was a participant.

Praiseworthy as our course of action has been in urging and participating in the exercise of United Nations jurisdiction over the threat to the peace of the world in Pakistan and India, history will show the disgraceful conduct of the United States in regard to the undeclared, unconstitutional, and illegal war in Asia and the failure on the part of the United States to ask for the application of the articles of the United Nations Charter to intervene in this threat to the peace of the world, in which the United States is part of the cause.

O, consistency where art thou?

What a chapter we are writing. I join in praising the President and the Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Goldberg, for their course of action, vis-a-vis the United Nations and the war between Pakistan and India.

But there is no praise due them for their failure to follow a consistent course of action in respect to the war in South Vietnam.

I hope that perhaps the precedent they have now set in respect to U.S. action, through the United Nations, in respect to the war between Pakistan and India, may cause them formally and officially to address the Security Council asking it to take jurisdiction over the war in Asia, as the charter requires.

I say to my President, my Ambassador in the United Nations, and my Secretary of State that I am not interested in their repeating the argument we have heard for some 2 years that we probably would not have unanimity of support on the Security Council if we followed that course of action.

My answer has continued to be the same answer I have given to the Senate for 2 years: We never know until we try, and we cannot justify not trying on the basis of a belief that if we try the resolution will be vetoed.

The American people are entitled to know what nation or nations refuse to live up to their commitments under the Charter of the United Nations.

If it is true that Russia and France would veto such a resolution, we have a clear moral duty and a legal obligation to show to the world what countries really do not want to abide by their commitments under the United Nations Treaty, other than the United States.

We are a self-convicted Nation in world history at this hour. We are a Nation which has convicted itself of a willful and knowing violation of its treaty obligations. Neither the President, nor the American Ambassador to the United Nations, nor the Secretary of State can erase that indelible recording that our violation of the treaty has written on the pages of history.

It is a great hour that announces a cease-fire in India and Pakistan. But I would like to see my country continue to write a glorious chapter of American history by proceeding forthwith to file the official resolution that the leaders of my country are bound to file under the charter, asking that the United Nations take jurisdiction over this shocking war in Asia.

If it did, I am satisfied it would also lead to an early cease-fire, followed by early negotiations for an honorable peace settlement under the auspices of the United Nations, bringing to an end this killing of increasing numbers of American boys and increasing numbers of Asians.

What a terrible page of history we are writing. We pick up the newspapers each day and read of the massacring that is going on in South Vietnam through the military might and power of the United States.

Each day we are increasing by the hundreds of thousands the Communists throughout Asia and the underdeveloped areas of the world. Each day, by this course of military action of the United States in Asia, we are jeopardizing future generations of American boys and girls, because if we continue to leave naught but a heritage of intense hatred to millions of people of the next generation and the generation to follow, what is the end?

As I have been heard to say before, there is no question that we can level North Vietnam and the Vietcong areas of South Vietnam.

They are without airpower. They are without any substantial military might. In a sense, our course of action of conducting war in Asia is similar to shooting fish in a barrel. We will win, as I have said so many times, every military engagement. Oh, yes; let me repeat, we can also go beyond North Vietnam and we can level the nuclear installations of Red China, which the dangerous war crowd in the Pentagon, composed, in my opinion, of the most desperate men in all the world, I believe have as their ultimate objective.

We can destroy the cities of Red China. We can bomb out what industrial complex she has. We can kill with our military airpower millions of her citizens, and leave to future generations of American boys and girls the certainty of the undying hatred of Asians for the United States.

What will that profit us? After we shall have devastated all the areas of Asia that we attack, we shall have to maintain for many decades to come large American military forces in Asia, to continue our domination.

Eventually, like every other Western power, we shall be driven out of Asia, for the yellow races will never surrender to domination by the United States, any more than they have been willing to surrender to domination by Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and every other Western power that has sought to maintain a colonial foothold on their land.

It may be said quickly in reply that we have no colonial designs on Asia. But we have, Mr. President. This form of military domination is naught but a form of colonial power. There is no doubt that the desperate men in the Pentagon seek to maintain a military foothold in southeast Asia, to the everlasting discredit and disgrace of our country.

I am at a complete loss to understand why, as a religious nation, we think it is morally justified to kill and kill and kill in southeast Asia on the pretext that we advance in justification and rationalization of our policy.

Mr. President, for every picture that we see in the American press, we can see many times that number of pictures in the foreign press, for the American people are being fed a censored journalism. If one wants to know what the United States is doing in southeast Asia, he cannot learn it from the American press; he must read it in the foreign press. If he really wants to see adequate pictorial coverage of American killing and of Americans being killed in Asia, he must look, for the most part, at the pictures in the foreign press.

With all that killing, I am aghast and at a loss to find the answer to the question: For what purpose? What is our objective? What do we think it will profit us, and in what values will the profits be measured? For at long last, as a result of multiple causes, most of which are yet to develop, this war, too,

will end. On what basis will it be settled?

After all the devastation, after all the loss of American and Asiatic life, how will the war be settled? I submit that it will be settled much on the same basis that it could and should be settled now, if the United Nations were called upon to exercise its jurisdiction, and if the United States would take that legal course of action that would require the United Nations to take jurisdiction either through the Security Council or the General Assembly. If we were to exercise the same kind of leadership we have just exercised with respect to the Indian and Pakistani war, the United Nations would take jurisdiction through one of its two great branches, either the Security Council or the General Assembly.

If we let the war in Asia run its military course, to end in the devastation of much of South Vietnam and North Vietnam, and I fear the potential is great for the devastation of Red China, too, we shall lack both the economic resources and the manpower to sustain the military victory. We shall win the war, but lose the peace. Of course, the value that really counts is the value of an honorable peace.

I realize that the propaganda forces in this country in these hours are so strong, and the misinformation that my Government is feeding the American people is so overwhelming, that it is difficult to impress such basic principles upon the American people. But I am satisfied that eventually American history will record that we who have for the past 2 years consistently raised our voices in the cause of an honorable peace, in the cause of keeping our treaty commitments and our treaty obligations, and in the cause of keeping faith with our professed ideal of substituting the rule of law for the rule of military might will be sustained. It is not important what history will record about us. What is important is whether my country, without further delay, will stop its unjustifiable killing of human beings, when it has, first, the clear duty to exhaust every procedure available to it under existing treaties and under the procedures of international law.

So I applaud the President, the Ambassador to the United Nations, and the Secretary of State for the great statesmanship they have displayed in connection with the Pakistani and Indian war. I express again my strong disappointment in their failure to apply the same duties of statesmanship in respect to our country's course of action in making war in Asia.

FOREIGN WASTE UNABATED

That leads me to comment, as I said a few moments ago I would comment, on my reasons for agreeing to a unanimous-consent request to consider, by way of a limitation of debate, the report of the Committee on Appropriations now pending before the Senate in respect to foreign aid. I shall vote against that appropriation for it should, in my opinion, have been cut by a minimum of $500 million. Much of our military aid is against the interests of a peaceful world; so much of our military aid around the world is giving support to forces that are trampling the cause of freedom under the iron heel of military oligarchies. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I wish to say that most of our military aid to Latin America is unjustifiable, for it is sent there to keep down freedom.

As I have said so many times, I am perfectly willing to vote $2 for economic aid properly administered for every dollar of military aid that Congress will subtract from its military aid program.

I shall vote against the foreign aid appropriation bill tomorrow also because there is such waste and inefficiency in the administration of our economic foreign aid in country after country.

However, what can be gained by the senior Senator from Oregon refusing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on the foreign aid appropriation bill, when I know the die is cast, and when year after year I have talked hour by hour in the presentation of one unanswerable fact after another on the abuses of foreign aid and the waste and inefficiency?

Let the RECORD show again that not once in 3 years has any Senator rebutted even one finding of fact of the Comptroller General of the United States, who in report after report has supplied the senior Senator from Oregon and every other Senator with unanswerable factual data concerning the mismanagement and the waste and the inefficiency, and the cause of corruption in many a government in the world as a result of the mismanagement of American foreign aid.

Every Member of the Senate is fully familiar with those arguments. I wish I could say that every Senator had gone down to the committee rooms to read the top secret reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, which I have piled high each year on my desk and measured for the benefit of the Senate with a ruler. This year they reached higher than 24 inches, each document the dimensions of a Time magazine.

Many a Senator has not been willing to read the facts. Obviously by their votes Senators have not been willing to face the facts.

No lengthy argument by the senior Senator from Oregon on a foreign aid appropriation bill this year will change that fixed attitude of Members of the Senate, or of an overwhelming majority of them.

I have been encouraged somewhat by the increasing number of votes that we have been receiving in opposition to at least parts of the foreign aid bill, and the increasing number of votes that we have received on the passage of the bill.

However, I never knowingly fool myself, and I know that the attitude that exists in this body in regard to the pleas that the administration has made, including the great lobby conference that was held in this Capitol, not far from where I speak, convened at the request of the Vice President of the United States, at which top administration spokesmen presented the administration's position in support of the passage of the appropriation bill without change.

Mr. President, I am fully aware that, as a result of that kind of lobbying, the Senate will pass tomorrow this appropriation bill by an overwhelming majority, but not with my vote.

Let me make it very clear that I do not question the sincerity, the public dedication, the patriotism, and the honest beliefs of the Vice President of the United States or the President of the United States or Mr. Bell, the Administrator of the foreign aid program. My opposition to their point of view is completely impersonal. They are dead wrong in the course of action into which they are leading this Nation in respect to foreign aid.

The overwhelming majority of the Senate of the United States is thoroughly wrong in its failure to insist upon a reform of foreign aid and the elimination of the waste and the inefficiency and the corruption that is caused by it.

I have been heard to say in the major debates on the bill that, in my judgment, our foreign aid program is probably the greatest assistance to the Communists in the world that could possibly be provided because, as a result of its mismanagement, its waste, its inefficiency, and its causing of corruption, it strengthens the hand of the Communist forces in many countries of the world.

Mr. President, that just happens to be, as far as the bill which will be before the Senate tomorrow is concerned, an ugly political reality.

I shall make a brief speech against the bill tomorrow. I am planning at the present time, for the RECORD, to offer a few amendments, unless, upon further reflection, I decide that that might just be a wasteful exercise. Then I shall vote against the bill and wait for the American people to take their accounting at the ballot boxes in 1966 and 1968 in respect to candidates for Congress and candidates for office in the executive branch of the Government. There is no other answer.

If the American people are willing to support this program at the ballot boxes of America, it is their democratic right. But I am satisfied that eventually those in Congress who have, by and large, been supporting the foreign policy course of action of our Government in recent years will find that, at long last, American public opinion will repudiate their policy. That is, they will unless, as one of the results of maintaining this kind of policy, this country goes all the way to the end of the road of government by executive supremacy, for, when the Senate votes tomorrow on this bill, it will be voting in part as the result of the growing development in this country over the past few years of a government by executive supremacy in which, more and more, Congress is becoming naught but a rubberstamp for the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon building. If the American people travel the full length of that road, they will then have written the history of the decline and loss of freedom in the United States.

I regret very much that my conscience and my convictions compel me to make this speech tonight, for I am perfectly aware of the interpretations of parts of it that some will make. But so long as I serve in this body, I will continue to tell the American people what I honestly believe the facts are in regard to any issue that confronts the people through the Congress of the United States.

So I have agreed to a limitation of debate on the foreign aid appropriations bill tomorrow, for I am satisfied that under the time element that is allowed, the points of both those who support the bill and those who oppose it can be made for the RECORD; and once made, I know of no good purpose that could be served by prolonging the debate.

That does not mean that the senior Senator from Oregon, on other issues, will not agree to engage in a prolonging of debate and opposing of a unanimous consent agreement to limitation of debate. For there are issues, Mr. President, in which a prolonged debate can change Senate opinion, and can provide the necessary time for public opinion to work its will upon the Members of the U.S. Senate.

But I have become satisfied that this is not one of those issues. For I think that at this time of war hysteria, not stalking but galloping abroad in the land, there is no hope, at the present time, for public opinion to stop, look and listen long enough to work its will on the Senate of the United States. Therefore, I consider it to be my clear course, and duty, to cooperate with the majority leader, by agreeing to the unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of time to express my views on the matter tonight, as I have just done, briefly express them tomorrow, and then go to a vote.

I wish to say, as I close, that I am very appreciative to the U.S. Senate that at least it stopped the steamroller enough in its consideration of the foreign aid bill this year, to approve the Fulbright amendment and the Morse amendment to the foreign aid bill. These amendments provided for a 2-year authorization of foreign aid, with the understanding that during that 2-year period, the Morse amendment would work its will on the record of foreign aid; and the Morse amendment, as the Senate knows, was one that provided that at the beginning of fiscal 1967, the foreign aid program would be ended and a new foreign aid program would start, and that foreign aid program thereafter would be the result of the findings of a special committee that the Morse amendment provided for. During that 2-year period the special committee would make a complete analysis, survey, review and investigation of foreign aid, and make recommendations to the appropriate committees of the Congress as to the type of foreign aid that should be adopted in replacement of the wasteful, inefficient and corruption-causing foreign aid program that is now characterized by the foreign aid program that the Senate tomorrow is going to appropriate money to continue, but which I shall vote against.

I appreciate, Mr. President, that we made that much progress this year, and that for 2 months the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and chairman of the Senate conferees handling the foreign aid bill, in conference with the House of Representatives, stubbornly resisted the demands of the House conferees to drop the Fulbright and Morse amendments. But at long last, the majority of my colleagues on the conference decided that the wishes of the administration should be met, and voted to recede from the Senate's position.

I do not criticize them for it; I simply disagree with them. I do not castigate them for it; I merely express disappointment that they yielded. I think it would have been much better, Mr. President, if we had remained in deadlock. There was no great hurry. The pipeline is full. Foreign aid has more money than it can spend for months ahead.

Eventually, if we had not yielded, I believe there would have been a change of attitude at the administration level, because if the administration had changed its attitude, the House conferees would have changed theirs.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield in a moment. The House conferees sat there, knowing that they had the administration behind them. Therefore, so far as I was concerned, it was not a contest between the Senate conferees and the House conferees, but a contest between the Senate conferees and the Secretary of State and the Director of AID and the Secretary of Defense. Senators know how long I would have had to wait. It would have been for the proverbial length of time until a snowball would have frozen in a hot oven. That is where the mistake was made. We had the Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations. We had the Director of AID before us, and we got some semantics, but not one rock-ribbed commitment did we get from either the Secretary of State or the Director of AID.

It is very easy to say to a group of Senators: "We are concerned, too. We want to assure you that we will cooperate with you. If you have a survey or a study made by the committee, we will cooperate with you."

Not once did we get a commitment from the Secretary of State or from the Director of AID that they would make any of the changes that the Comptroller General reports very clearly dictated should be made.

So I never would have yielded. I would have insisted that the administration should first come forward with some commitments to remedy foreign aid in respect to some of the abuses in foreign aid which no one can dispute if he is willing to read the RECORD.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I extend to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] my very sincere regrets that I did not yield to him when he asked me to yield. I was in the midst of a thought which I wished to complete, and some emergency developed which made it necessary for him to leave the Chamber.

I am sure that he will understand I intended no discourtesy to him, as I never intend any discourtesy in extending to my colleagues every parliamentary consideration that I can.

Mr. President, I close my remarks by saying that I hope, in the next session of Congress, the facts will not dictate a speech such as this one. I hope that next year I will find myself in a position where I can support a foreign aid bill and a foreign aid appropriation, which I will do whenever foreign aid is reformed along the lines for which I have battled many years in the Senate, and which increasing numbers of Congressmen and Senators have started to support.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, September 23, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 22 (legislative day of September 20), 1965:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Donald E. O'Brien, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Cecil F. Poole, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of California for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

John T. Curtin, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of New York for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

I nominate the following named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Gordon B. Roden, Pisgah, in place of V. B. Gross, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Blount Hohn, Diaz, in place of C. E. Parsley, retired.

Douglas Stroud, Huntsville, in place of L. T. Lewis, transferred.

Clark Walker, Springdale, in place of G. L. Sanders, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Norman J. Pope, New Almaden, in place of C. B. Perham, resigned.

GEORGIA

Woodrow W. Gay, Cordele, in place of W. H. Johnston, retired.

James A. Howard, Jr., Dearing, in place of A. S. Mitchell, retired.

IOWA

Coline L. Morisky, Fostoria, in place of W. W. Terry, deceased.

Gerald F. Siebels, Minden, in place of G .R. Patterson, Jr., transferred.

Clarence L. Busch, Persia, in place of J. M. Kuster, resigned.

KANSAS

Louise L. Atwell, Kismet, in place of Ethel Prater, retired.

Earl K. Pennington, Rantoul, in place of E. D. Medlen, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Dallas L. Crace, Campbellsville, in place of L. H. Tarter, retired.

Mildred J. Jackson, Mayking, in place of M. E. Webb, retired.

MAINE

Wesley G. Oliver, Nobleboro, in place of S. P. Oliver, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Veronica E. Walsh, Ulysses, in place of W. R. Byam, retired.

NEW YORK

William M. Fleckenstein, Colden, in place of G. W. Miller, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Billy V. Overman, Rockwell, in place of F. W. Kluttz, retired.

OKLAHOMA

James A. Maddux, Cheyenne, in place of J. W. Chalfant, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Woodrow W. Clapper, Bedford, in place of C. W. Allen, retired.

James E. Pontious, Edinboro, in place of Allan Rye, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Stanmore T. McClain, Williston, in place of N. B. Birt, retired.

TEXAS

Orveta D. Generaux, Addison, in place of E. B. Lewis, retired.

Narvie L. Caperton, Cameron, in place of J. R. Hays, retired.

Frank N. Simpson, McLean, in place of B. R. Reeves, transferred.

Wynell C. Watson, Troy, in place of H. E. Weir, deceased.

Margaret L. Cooke, Waskom, in place of P. P. Pollard, retired.

VIRGINIA

Richard E. Durham, Millboro, in place of J. S. Clarkson, retired.

WISCONSIN

Donald E. Peters, Juneau, in place of P. A. Panetti, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 22 (legislative day of September 20), 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Richard H. Davis, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

John H. Burns, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Tanzania.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The New Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 22, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, last spring my colleague, Hon. OTIS PIKE and I sponsored two famous institutions in the House dining room; namely, strawberries and Long Island duckling. Today, I would like to say a few words about another famous Long Island institution—Republic Aviation Corp. and its current famous product, the F–105 Thunderchief fighter-bomber.

I am very proud of Republic and the F–105, which is doing such an outstanding job in Vietnam. In some 2,000 sorties, the F–105 has had less than 3 percent air and ground aborts, and it is operating on a close to 90 percent in-commission rate. The Thunderchief is not only on the job, it is doing the job.

Some months ago, my attention was drawn to Republic by stories of the impact that the withdrawal of the F–105 from production was having upon the local economy. With the phase-out of production of that aircraft, it became necessary to reduce employment drastically. It also was necessary to consolidate facilities to control the cost of doing business and to remain competitive. However, when I looked into the matter, I was gratified to find that Republic was facing up realistically to the problems caused by the loss of F–105 production. The company was already hard at work to retain its reputation as a quality designer and manufacturer of military aircraft, meanwhile seeking new business in many other areas.

I was amazed and delighted to learn of some of these new projects. For example, in its research laboratories, Republic has developed a tiny pump—no larger than a half-dollar—that can be implanted into the head of a child suffering from hydrocephalus, a dreaded disease of childhood known as "water on the brain." The pump substitutes for the impaired body function and relieves the fluid pressure. As a result, there is now hope for the thousands of new cases of hydrocephalus occurring in this country each year. I understand that the principle involved can also be extended to other conditions, such as the automatic metering of insulin in diabetic patients. Products like this are being developed at Republic as byproducts of the work it is doing for the manned space effort.

Just as striking is the fact that Republic's new attitude plus the excellence of its retained technical capability are beginning to show signs of producing multifold benefits for the Nation. Again, for example, last July it was announced that Republic had won the phase II hardware development program for the advanced orbiting solar observatory; also, more recently, Republic qualified along with three other weapon system manufacturers to receive a study contract that will lay the groundwork for the development of an advanced vertical takeoff aircraft. And Republic is a senior member of the team that helped General Electric to win its role in the manned orbiting laboratory program. Beyond these, the next weapon system is somewhere on Republic's many drawing boards, and these development efforts are being heavily directed toward advanced V/Stol fighter-bombers, tactical aircraft and hypersonic vehicles.

Though these recent successes are a long way from replacing what was lost by the phaseout of the F–105, they are a giant step in the right direction. Republic has reacted positively to a reverse of fortune in the best tradition of American enterprise by realistically assessing itself and its situation. Not unlike strawberries and duckling, this is another Long Island institution I confidently expect is going to be around a long time.

Community Believes in Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 22, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the community of Ellettsville in Monroe County, Ind., dedicated a new firehouse.

It was understandably a festive occasion, for they not only have an excellent new building for their fire trucks, but space was provided for an excellent community hall as well.

What is truly commendable about this new structure however is the way it came into being. Every cent for the construction of the building was donated by local people—none came from taxes of any variety.

In addition the townsmen contributed their labor for the construction, so that the money collected went primarily for the building materials.

For many years the town of Ellettsville has been known as a wonderful community, exemplifying the best in Hoosier smalltown life. This latest achievement fits very well with the record of Ellettsville.